DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 245 020 UD 023 603

TITLE	Three Cities That Are Making Desegregation Work. Thirty Years after Brown. Report of a National Education Association Special Study.
INSTITUTION	National Education Association, Washington, D.C. Committee on Civil and Human Rights of Educators.
PUB DATE	17 May 84
NOTE	114p.; Prepared by the Desegregation Inquiry Panel, based on on-site hearings conducted in Charlotte-Mecklenburg, North Carolina; Austin, Texas; and Seattle, Washington.
AVAILABLE FROM	NEA Professional Library, P.O. Box 509, West Haven, CT 06516 ($5.95 for NEA members; $12.95 for nonmembers).
PUB TYPE	Reports - General (140)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Desegregation Effects; *Educational Quality; Elementary Secondary Education; Equal Education; *Federal Government; *Government Role; Hearings; Interviews; *School Desegregation; State Departments of Education; *Success; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	Austin Independent School District TX; Charlotte Mecklenburg Public Schools NC; Seattle Public Schools WA

ABSTRACT

The experiences of three educationally strong, desegregated urban school systems are the subject of this report. The three school systems are Charlotte-Mecklenburg County, North Carolina, Austin Independent School District, Texas, and the Seattle Public Schools, Washington. The report is divided into five chapters. Chapter 1 discusses the current national climate of waning commitment to school desegregation and outlines some of the signals of desegregation success in the school systems under study. Chapter 2 traces the history of desegregation in each system. Chapter 3 examines what made desegregation work in the three systems and identifies unifying characteristics and conditions that have contributed to the desegregation process in all three. Certain patterns of success that could be exemplary for other school communities are suggested. Chapter 4 analyzes persistent problems that inhibit the effort to move toward the integration of programs and people that is essential to achievement of the goals of equity and excellence in education. The final chapter summarizes the roles of school officials, teachers and teacher organizations, community leaders, city governments, and State departments of education in school desegregation and emphasizes the pivotal nature of the Federal role. Recommendations for Presidential and Congressional actions to ensure effective desegregation are made. Appendices list participants in the hearings on which the report is based, and reproduce the thoughts of Austin's school superintendent, John Ellis, on school desegregation. (Author/CMG)

ED245020

Three Cities That Are Making Desegregation Work

REPORT OF A NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION SPECIAL STUDY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G. FELTON
NEA

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

UD023603

nea *National Education Association* Human and Civil Rights Washington, D.C. May 17, 1984

Copyright © 1984
National Education Association of the United States
1201 16th St., N.W. 20036

Mary Hatwood Futrell, *President*
Don Cameron, *Executive Director*
Keith Geiger, *Vice President*
Roxanne Bradshaw, *Secretary-Treasurer*
Ruby E. King, *Associate Executive Director for Public Affairs*
Charles T. Williams, *Director of Human and Civil Rights*

Cover photos by Nancy J. Pierce.
Charlotte-Mecklenburg photos by Nancy J. Pierce.
Austin photos by Peter Silva.
Seattle photos by Davidson Communications.

Design by Jim True and Carol Gerson.
Typesetting by Barbara Bohrer.

Contents

JUN 14 1964

	Preface
	Foreword
INTRODUCTION	Premises and Purposes, 11
CHAPTER 1	Thirty Years Later: Progress Despite Resistance, 17
CHAPTER 2	From "All Deliberate Speed" . . . to "Plans that Promise Realistically to Work Now," 23
	Charlotte-Mecklenburg, 24
	Austin, 38
	Seattle, 53
CHAPTER 3	Patterns of Achievement, 71
CHAPTER 4	Barriers to Integration, 83
CHAPTER 5	Conclusions and Recommendations: "Forming the Future," 97
APPENDIX I	Participants—Open Hearings, 105
APPENDIX II	Thoughts on School Desegregation: One Superintendent's Views, 113

Preface

The National Education Association is deeply indebted to the members of the Desegregation Inquiry Panel who prepared this report. As is always the case, busy, committed people will find time to perform important tasks.

Educational equity and educational excellence are inseparable. All children in America must be taught; quality education must include the lessons of pluralism—that is what the desegregation and integration of our schools are all about.

This report makes clear that there is a great deal more to do to achieve equity through quality integrated education. The panel's recommendations, if implemented, would go a long way toward achieving that goal. The National Education Association is committed to do those things within its power to see to it that the implementation begins now.

MARY HATWOOD FUTRELL, *President*
National Education Association
Washington, D.C.
May 17, 1984

Foreword

This report of the NEA Desegregation Inquiry Panel reflects the collective judgment of its eight members who have seen desegregation work in the three cities the panel visited, Charlotte-Mecklenburg, Austin, and Seattle.

The cooperation of the members of the three boards of education, school districts' staff, leaders and staff of the education associations, and the witnesses was invaluable to the panel. Many people interrupted their regular pursuits to prepare and present testimony and provide supporting documents to the panel.

The panel is indebted to those listed in Appendix I, the witnesses—and to many who worked behind the scenes, for providing it with the foundation on which this report rests.

We would like to thank the small but dedicated and talented group of NEA staff members who supported the panel—Dorothy Massie, inquiry coordinator and writer; Boyd Bosma, Lauvon Carter, Ramon MacFarlane, and Martha Ware, who planned and assisted at the on-site hearings; and Stefanie Weiss, who edited the report and guided it through the printing process. Thanks also to Marian Clayton and Peter Woolfolk of NEA Communications staff who assisted the panel and the media.

SUSIE JABLINSKE, *Chair*
NEA Desegregation Inquiry Panel
Annapolis, Maryland
May 17, 1984

SUSIE JABLINSKE

DR. ARTHUR FLEMMING

DOROTHY JONES

DR. DONALD G. JACOBS

DON WILSON

RAUL GRIJALVA

DR. BEVERLY COLE and PROF. MEYER WEINBERG

NEA DESEGREGATION INQUIRY PANEL

DR. BEVERLY COLE
Director of Education
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People
New York, New York

DR. ARTHUR FLEMMING
Chair, Citizens' Commission on Civil Rights
Washington, D.C.

RAUL GRIJALVA
Member, Board of Education
Tucson Unified School District
Tuscon, Arizona

SUSIE JABLINSKE
Chair, NEA Inquiry Panel;
Member, NEA Committee on Civil Rights; and
President, Teachers Association of Anne Arundel County
Annapolis, Maryland

DR. DONALD G. JACOBS
Director, Partners in Ecumenism
National Council of Churches
New York, New York

DOROTHY JONES
Director, Office of Desegregation, Cambridge Public Schools; and
Chair, National Committee for School Desegregation
Cambridge, Massachusetts

PROF. MEYER WEINBERG
Editor, *Integrated Education*; and
Director, Horace Mann Bond Center for Equal Education
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts

DON WILSON
President, Ohio Education Association; and
Member, NEA Task Force on Excellence
Columbus, Ohio

STAFF ASSISTANTS

MARTHA L. WARE
Manager, Human and Civil Rights

DOROTHY MASSIE
Inquiry Specialist
Study Coordinator and Writer

BOYD BOSMA
Human and Civil Rights Specialist

LAUVON CARTER
Project Secretary

RAMON MACFARLANE
Human and Civil Rights Specialist

STEFANIE WEISS
Information Specialist

MARIAN CLAYTON
Staff Writer, Communications

PETER WOOLFOLK
Manager, Communications

INTRODUCTION:

Premises and Purposes

In these days, it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education. Such an opportunity, where the state has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms.

We conclude that in the field of public education, the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal.

THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT in
Brown v. Board of Education, May 17, 1954

The *Brown* decision was met with massive resistance by many southern states and with only scattered compliance initiatives. Nevertheless, with the rise of the civil rights movement in the '60s and '70s, the mandate for equity in education became an issue of foremost national concern. This was a time of rising expectations for public schools, as well as for many of the children they served. Educational leaders—both academics and activists—were turning their attention, as never before, to the design of programs to desegregate schools, to eliminate racial discrimination in the schools, and to remedy the effects of past discrimination.

By the early 1970s, significant progress had been made in dismantling the dual systems of southern and border states; and many school systems in the North and West were beginning to deal with their own problems of racial and ethnic isolation and inequality in the schools.

At pivotal periods during these first 20 years after *Brown*, the federal government, spurred by civil rights demands, led

the way in the school desegregation movement. Through federal court orders, civil rights legislation, administrative enforcement, and presidential leadership, all three federal branches of government came together to move this nation closer than ever before toward achieving equal educational opportunity for all Americans.

But the nation's leadership and governmental priorities began to change long before the task was completed. Not all presidents in the past have been civil rights advocates; over the past four years, however, an Administration, backed by well organized and powerfully regressive political forces, appears to have given top priority to the erasure of school desegregation and civil rights advancement from the national agenda.

PURPOSES OF THIS STUDY

At a time when the national Administration is seeking to halt, if not reverse, school desegregation progress, the National Education Association brought together a special Inquiry Panel to study the experiences of three educationally strong, desegregated urban school systems, and to report on that experience. The NEA hoped to:

- confirm the understanding that, despite problems, school desegregation is alive and well—that it is workable and is working successfully in some school communities;
- provide information, gathered from the experiences of these school systems, that might encourage and assist other school leaders and community supporters in the continuance and renewal of programs to desegregate schools and equalize educational opportunity;
- make common cause with those who are working to revive governmental and public interest in school desegregation and equality of educational opportunity as vital national priorities.

PREMISES OF STUDY

The NEA study was motivated by four fundamental convictions:

1. That the Supreme Court was right in 1954. Racially segregated schools are inherently unequal, not because children of color cannot learn unless they are seated next to white children, but because the system of imposed racial segregation is itself discriminatory; and because as long as the governance of public education is in the control of a white power structure, children in racially segregated Black and Brown schools are not likely to have equal access to educational resources and opportunities.

2. That racial isolation is harmful to the education of white children, instilling in them a provincialism and false

perception of their own place in the world, and depriving them of the opportunity to understand, appreciate, and learn to relate to children whose race, ethnicity, and culture are different from their own. The children who are schooled in such racial and ethnic insularity are further deprived of an understanding of our society and its history, and are ill prepared to cope with the realities of the world they are soon to enter as adult citizens.

3. That the desegregation, followed by the integration of public schools, must be central to all other civil rights efforts in this nation. If we are ever to overcome the barriers of race, it will be through the children—if they are given an opportunity to know and respect others who are different from themselves before they have learned the lessons of hate. This can happen in racially integrated schools—but probably not without them.

4. That the quest for educational excellence is reduced to mere elitism if it fails to include a concern for equity, and if it fails to teach young people about all the different races and cultures that comprise our diverse society and have created its history. Educational excellence cannot exist in segregated schools.

STUDY LOCATIONS AND DESIGN

In selecting the school systems to be studied, the NEA looked for the following characteristics: (1) a systemwide desegregation program; (2) an educationally strong program of instruction; (3) differing racial and ethnic composition of the student population in each of the three systems selected; and (4) geographic locations representative of diverse regions of the country.

The three school systems selected were: Charlotte-Mecklenburg County, North Carolina; Austin Independent School District, Texas; and the Seattle Public Schools, Washington.

The members of the NEA Inquiry Panel, all serving as volunteers, are leaders in the fields of education and religion and specialists in school desegregation issues.

The panel held open hearings at each study location, each three days in duration, during the months of December, 1983, and January and February, 1984. During these hearings, panel members talked with teachers, administrators, school board members, former school officials and staff members, civic and community leaders, students, and parent activists. In Seattle, the panel also met with the mayor of the city, with state educational leaders, and with a representative of the Community Relations Service of the U.S. Department of Justice. Appendix I lists the persons interviewed at each study location. The meeting schedule at each location provided time for the panel to meet with individuals and groups who had not scheduled interviews in advance. In addition to hearing testimony, the NEA panel divided into teams at each

From left to right: Panelists RAUL GRIJALVA, DR. ARTHUR FLEMMING, MARTHA L. WARE (Manager, NEA Human and Civil Rights), SUSIE JABLINSKE, DON WILSON, DR. BEVERLY COLE, and PROF. MEYER WEINBERG.

site to visit schools and classsrooms, where they talked further with principals, teachers, other school personnel, and students.

Throughout the onsite phase of the study, panel members sought answers to the following kinds of questions:

- What policies and practices have worked or have been effective that could be useful as guidance to other desegregating districts?
- How have students, teachers, and the community itself been affected by the desegregation process?
- What has happened to the quality of education as a result of desegregation?
- What effect, if any, has school desegregation had on public support of the schools? On relations among students? On teacher attitudes? On student test scores?
- What are some of the problems that have obstructed the desegregation process and how has the school system dealt with these? What problems remain? And how are these being handled?

REPORT FORMAT

The report is divided into five chapters. Chapter 1 discusses the current national climate of waning commitment to school desegregation in particular, and civil rights in general, and, in counterpoint, outlines some of the signals of desegregation success in the three school systems under study.

Chapter 2 traces the history of desegregation in each of the three urban school systems.

Chapter 3 examines what made desegregation work in these three school systems and identifies unifying characteristics and conditions that have contributed to the desegregation process in all three systems. It suggests certain patterns of success that could be exemplary for other school communities.

Chapter 4 analyzes the persisting problems that inhibit the effort to move toward the integration of program and people that is essential to achievement of the goals of equity and excellence in education.

Chapter 5 contains a brief summary statement of the important roles to be played by various concerned groups at the state and local level—school officials and administrators; teachers and their organizations; civic and community leaders, city governments, and state departments of education—in the desegregation of public schools. The progress of all these groups will be conditioned by the quality and strength of leadership provided by the federal government. The specific recommendations of this chapter, therefore, are directed toward the kinds of action that must be taken by the President and the Congress of the United States, if this nation is to move once again toward realization of its vital national interest in quality integrated education.

1

Thirty Years Later: Progress Despite Resistance

The long and arduous effort to fulfill the mandate of *Brown* has been so often frustrated; its failures have been so widely publicized and its victories so little noted that many Americans have come to accept the assessment of its opponents that school desegregation is a lost battle. The task has taken too long, they say. Not only are the benefits unclear, but the President's own Commission on Excellence in Education has told us that the nation's public schools are being engulfed by a "rising tide of mediocrity"; and that we in this country, having lost sight of the basic purposes of schooling, have been committing "an act of unthinking, unilateral educational disarmament." Implicit in the claims of educational decline is the contention that desegregation is to blame.

As if to confirm this charge, the current national Administration has not only refused to enforce desegregation laws and court orders; it has actively challenged them. While giving lip service to voluntary desegregation efforts, the Administration has persuaded the Congress to eliminate or drastically curtail the resources that enable school systems to carry out desegregation programs, even voluntary ones.

Even some of the leaders in the struggle for educational equity appear to have succumbed to terminal discouragement with the desegregation movement and have turned their attention to other, more currently favored causes. One of these involves the reordering of priorities, the striving for educational excellence in America's urban ghetto schools, *to the exclusion of,* rather than *in addition to,* desegregation efforts. This assumes that there is some sort of fair or rational choice between constitutional rights and quality education.

UNSUNG VICTORIES

The anti-desegregation mood of many national leaders today overlooks some remarkable changes that have occurred over the past 10 years. Racial isolation persists in the nation's largest cities; and in the states with the heaviest concentration of Hispanic students, these students remain segregated. However, in 29 states, fewer than one-fourth of the Hispanic students were in predominantly minority schools in 1980. In the nation as a whole, from 1968 to 1980, Black students in schools with 90 percent to 100 percent minority enrollment dropped from 65 percent to 33 percent. In the West, during these years, the proportion of Black students in predominantly minority schools decreased from 51 percent to 33 percent. And in the South, it can be said that the dual school system has been very nearly eliminated. In 1968, throughout the southern states, 78 percent of Black students were in schools with 90 percent to 100 percent Black enrollment; in 1980, this proportion of Black students had decreased to 23 percent.[1]

The fact is, many communities throughout the country have successfully desegregated their public schools. The processes of desegregation have never been without trauma; and the challenges of transition from desegregation to integration are not without problems. But citizens in many desegregated school communities—parents, school officials, teachers, students—unhesitatingly point to the educational and social benefits of desegregation.

Even in cities like Boston, where violence a decade ago temporarily disfigured a court-mandated plan, schools are far more desegregated than in 1974. Also, minorities are well represented among teachers and staff and on the Boston School Committee, in contrast with the situation before the court order.

Resistance to school desegregation is noisy; it celebrates conflict and feeds on media attention. The effective desegregation of schools is silent; it involves the incorporation of a new direction to everyday school affairs in a school system. Thus, desegregation progress is not measurable by noise, or by headlines. To find out about school desegregation achievement, it is necessary to do what the NEA Inquiry Panel did: that is, to go from city to city, ask questions, and see how the job is being done.

The three cities the panel visited—Charlotte-Mecklenburg, North Carolina; Austin, Texas; and Seattle, Washington—provided encouraging news about the benefits of school desegregation. Here are some of the data that signaled the desegregation achievements of these school systems.

Charlotte-Mecklenburg County

We did have two communities. We had two cities, a white city and a Black city. In my community the only time I saw a white person was when the insurance man showed up. Now, because of desegregation, I have friends I would not have had. I'm not saying it's all sugar and everything is wonderful because this cake ain't finished baking yet. It's started to rise, but it's not finished.

BEATRICE THOMPSON, former student, Charlotte public schools (born in 1954, now a TV reporter)

In the fall of 1970, Charlotte-Mecklenburg County became the first school district in the nation to undertake a court-ordered plan involving systemwide busing as a tool to help achieve racial desegregation.

In the summer of 1975, Judge James McMillan, the federal district court judge whose decision in *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education* had been unanimously upheld by the Supreme Court,[2] issued a final order, in effect closing this landmark case, "with grateful appreciation to all who have made possible this court's graduation from *Swann*."[3]

In 1984, the Charlotte-Mecklenburg school system operates 100 schools enrolling 72,000 students—61 percent white, 39 percent Black—and transports 48,000 students daily, one-half of these for desegregation purposes.

The desegregation plan has been modified five times since 1975 to correct racial balance, to use the school buildings more fully, and to create neighborhood schools as communities have become integrated.

Local support of the school system is high as evidenced by recent bond issue successes.

Student test scores are up. Charlotte-Mecklenburg students have scored above the national average in the California Achievement Test for the past four years, a first-time record for the district since testing began in the state in 1967.

The achievement test score gap between Black and white students has continued to narrow over the past four years.

The school system, once torn by anti-busing, anti-desegregation violence, has achieved stability in both governance and operation. The current superintendent came to the district in 1977. No incumbent board member has been defeated in the last four elections. No one has been elected to the board on an anti-busing position since 1972.

Two of the nine board members are Black, all elected at large in a county and city school district that is only 25

percent Black. A third Black board member resigned recently when elected to the North Carolina General Assembly.

The City of Charlotte elected its first Black mayor late in 1983.

Austin

At the beginning of my senior year, I looked back and I thought about all the kids that had gone to junior high with me and . . . had either rented apartments which said they are in another school district . . . or had transferred to private schools. . . or had just moved. . . And I looked at them and I realized how much they had lost because I had such a learning experience at Johnston. . . I have learned to meet everyone. . . . I feel that I have kind of grown as a person into adulthood. . . .

LISA HICKEY, student,
Austin public schools

After ten years of court hearings, rejected desegregation plans, and appeals, ultimately involving all three levels of the federal court system, the Austin Independent School District (AISD) in August 1980 began implementation of a tri-ethnic desegregation plan. The plan involved the transporting of approximately 12,500 students outside their neighborhoods, and the reassignment of 1,000 staff members for desegregation purposes.

The Austin school system, its boundaries extending to an area double the size of the city itself, enrolls 56,000 students—52 percent white, 29 percent Hispanic, and 19 percent Black. The ethnic distribution of Austin's public school enrollment has remained essentially stable over the past three years; the number of white students increased slightly in 1982-83.

The district operates 422 buses, transporting students close to six million miles a year. Altogether 20,000 students are transported by bus, slightly more than half of these for desegregation purposes.

School year 1982-83, the second year of system-wide desegregation, marked the reversal of a seven-year enrollment decline.

Average daily attendance in Austin public schools has increased steadily under the current desegregation plan. Before desegregation, the attendance level was 92.1 percent; in 1982-83, the district had a 92.7 percent attendance rate, the highest yearly average rate ever recorded.

Community support for the schools is high; in 1982, a school bond issue was approved by a three-to-one margin.

Student test scores have increased at all grade levels within the past three years. Student achievement test scores on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) at grades seven and eight were below the national level in 1980; now student ITBS scores are well above the national average at all grade levels.

Black and Hispanic test scores have increased at a slightly higher rate than those of white students, evidencing a gradual narrowing of the achievement gap between minority and white students that was entrenched under segregation.

Private school enrollment, which increased sharply during the first three years of the current desegregation plan, has begun to fall this year as, for the first time, white students have returned from the private to Austin's public schools.

Seattle

Students do have a chance to be educated in a multi-racial setting, and the community as a whole has come to grips with the fact that we live in a pluralistic society. . . . As I look at my own children, I am very much aware that they are coming through Seattle public schools differently than I did. . . . They have friends of all races and enjoy that. That was not my experience. I grew up in an all-white world in a city that was not all white. . . I think Seattle did a tremendous thing. . . But we still have work to do.

ANN SIQUELAND, Seattle parent,
leader of the desegregation movement,
author, *Without A Court Order*[4]

In the fall of 1978, Seattle became the first major city in the nation voluntarily to undertake a comprehensive desegregation program, involving systemwide reassignment of students. The plan is a complex and creative blend of mandatory student assignment with voluntary transfers to various program options, with the provision that the options chosen must contribute to racial balance at both the sending and receiving schools.

Desegregation of Seattle public schools involves not two races or three, but many different racial and ethnic groups. The school system enrolls approximately 44,000 students—51.4 percent white, 23.3 percent Black, 18 percent Asian American, 4.4 percent Hispanic, and 2.9 percent American Indian.

A total of 21,978 students are transported in Seattle public schools, approximately 16,000 of these for desegregation purposes.

The Seattle Plan has eliminated racial and ethnic imbal-

ance in all of the city's schools. The city has experienced enrollment losses in recent years, but similar or greater losses have occurred in neighboring suburban districts that have not desegregated.

In the first three years of the Seattle Plan, the proportion of majority students declined roughly three percent per year, the same rate as in the three years before the Plan. During the current year, the decline of white student enrollment has been less than one percent.

Student achievement test scores have risen slightly districtwide since implementation of the Seattle Plan. June 1982 test score data show that Seattle students, of all races, scored higher than the national average on the California achievement test.

Community support for the schools is high: At the last local property tax levy election, a near record rate of voter approval—roughly 85 percent—was achieved.

School desegregation is credited with having played a part in slowing, and even reversing, the trend toward greater residential segregation in some parts of the city. Recently the school board and city council have jointly adopted goals calling for coordinated action to encourage residential desegregation.

* * *

The achievements listed here, of course, are only a part of the desegregation story in these cities. Serious problems confront all three school communities as they work to avoid resegregation—both within schools and among them, to improve the quality of education available to all the students, and to institute equitable policies of student discipline and placement—in short, to make the difficult, critically important transition from desegregation to integration. The account of how the three school systems got to where they are today, and an analysis of the challenges they face comprise the following sections of this report.

2

From "All Deliberate Speed" . . . To Plans That "Promise Realistically To Work Now"

It was not until 1955—one year after its initial decision in *Brown*—that the Supreme Court issued an order explaining how it wished the process of school desegregation to be carried out. One of the most critical questions remaining had to do with the timetable to be set for desegregation: Would the Court require immediate compliance with its desegregation ruling, or would it allow southern school systems a gradual period of transition, to permit delays in full compliance "until the hard core of public opinion softened"?[1]

The answer favored gradualism. The Court took note of the massive changes local districts would have to make in order to comply with *Brown* and directed that school desegregation proceed, under the supervision of federal district courts, "with all deliberate speed."

But it was massive resistance, not change, that occupied much of the South for the next decade. Seven southern states passed "interposition" or "nullification" resolutions calling for defiance of the Supreme Court's order.[2] In 1956, a "Southern Manifesto," signed by nearly every elected representative and senator from the 11 southern states, pledged "to use all lawful means to bring about a reversal of this decision, which is contrary to the Constitution."[3] Prince Edward County, Virginia, shut down its entire school system rather than permit Black and white children to attend school together. Tuition grants were paid from tax monies to support segregated private schools for white children.[4]

Ten years after *Brown*, only 1.2 percent of the nearly three million Black students in 11 southern states attended schools with whites.[5]

The imaginations of Southerners in seeking ways to subvert Brown *were fertile. Throughout the next decade and a*

half segregation was perpetuated by such schemes as "freedom-of-choice" plans for pupil assignment, transfer programs for white students into majority white schools, tuition grants, tax credits for donations to private schools, sale or leasing of public schools to private academies, repeal of compulsory-attendance laws, ability grouping, racial assignments within schools, and attacks upon civil rights groups such as the NAACP and civil rights lawyers who were pressing for desegregation. The state of Georgia even made it a felony for a state official to spend money on racially integrated schools.[6]

The early impact of *Brown*, and the first steps toward dismantling the legal structure of segregation in Charlotte, North Carolina, and Austin, Texas, were described to the NEA Inquiry Panel by witnesses who recalled from their own experience the painful memories of those times. The Seattle story, while it had different beginnings from those of Charlotte and Austin, had many similarities in the intensity of conflict and the dimensions of eventual achievement.

Charlotte-Mecklenburg:

"Bussing is Necessary, Legal, Cheap, Safe, and Practical"

. . . that morning when Daddy let me out of the car and. . . . I started walking toward the school, a lot of people were just pushing and shoving and calling me names and throwing things, spitting on me and saying things . . . "Nigger, go back to Africa" . . . those kinds of things. But I am tall, you can see, and I had always been taught that you never drop your head. . . . So I walked with my head held high, and people said, "Oh, were you afraid?" Yes, in a sense. . . . Yes, you're afraid. But still. . . you don't look back. You keep going and you are hoping that things will get better. . . .

DOROTHY COUNTS SCOGGINS, one of the first five Black students to transfer to a formerly all-white school in Charlotte; now the parent of students in Charlotte-Mecklenburg public schools and director of a child development center in the city.

Things did not improve for the 15-year-old Dorothy Counts during her brief career as a pioneer in the desegregation of schools in Charlotte, North Carolina. Her parents withdrew her from the white high school at the end of a week. During that week, she was alternately shunned and harassed by other students. On her last day in the school, while standing at her locker, which had been broken into, Dorothy was hit in the back of the head with a piece of tin

and a blackboard eraser. Later that day, the back window of her father's car was found shattered. Throughout the week, the principal had witnessed Dorothy's treatment and had done nothing to halt the abuses or discipline the abusers.

Earlier that year, Dorothy Counts's parents had asked the Charlotte City School Board to approve her transfer from her assigned school, two miles distant from her home, to an all-white high school, located six blocks away, in her neighborhood. Amidst angry white protest, in July, 1957, the school board voted to accept the transfer request and to select four other students, from among 40 Black applicants, for transfer to formerly all-white schools.* The board took this action under authority of a new state policy granting North Carolina school districts the "local option" to effect such transfers. Other rights conferred by the local option policy included the right to close schools and to provide tax-supported tuition grants to white parents who chose to send their children to all-white private schools.

The chair of the state advisory committee that recommended the local option plan, in explaining its purpose, stated that the adoption of a carefully controlled student placement plan, permitting a few selected Blacks to enter white schools, would be a "safety valve against 'forced integration.'"[7] That advice proved to be entirely correct, for over the next eight years, no appreciable desegregation of Charlotte city schools occurred: In 1964, only 82 of the more than 20,000 Black school children in Charlotte were attending school with white children.

As late as 1965, the familiar orange busses traversed the county, plucking Black students of all ages from such school districts as Huntersville, Derita, Nations Ford and Pineville, and sending them to all-Black "union schools" that served grades 1-12.

It was bussing to achieve an arbitrary racial balance—or, more precisely, an arbitrary racial imbalance, for the sought-after ratio of Blacks in white schools was usually around zero. . . .[8]

CITY AND COUNTY CONSOLIDATION

The elimination of the dual school system was clearly not the aim of Charlotte's school and government officials during those early years. Nevertheless, in 1960, county and city leaders joined together in an action that would turn out to be one of the most important contributing factors to just that achievement. It was in 1960 that the Charlotte City Public Schools merged with the Mecklenburg County Public Schools.

*The other four students encountered no serious problems. Jeering crowds did greet one of the students on his first day at another white high school. However, when the principal made clear he would not tolerate trouble-makers, the crowds disappeared.

The merger created a metropolitan school district that could be operated more economically, more efficiently, and with greater educational benefits to all the students. The ultimate, and unforeseen, effect would be to create a situation in which school desegregation could take place with minimal white flight, thus without urban school ghettoization. With a school desegregation program encompassing the entire county, as well as the urban center, there would be few places to which opposing residents might flee.

SWANN BEGINS

In 1964, James, the six-year-old son of Vera and Darius Swann, was denied admission to a predominantly white school near his home on the campus of Johnson C. Smith University, where his father was a theology professor. The landmark civil rights case bearing his name was filed by 10 Black Charlotte families on behalf of their 25 children, and any other Black children similarly affected.

We filed a lawsuit in 1964, with the objective of getting the court to impose an affirmative obligation on the school board to disestablish the segregated system that it had created, and to effect as much desegregation in the system as possible, including the personnel and student activities.

JULIUS CHAMBERS, attorney for plaintiffs in *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg*[9]

The plaintiffs in *Swann* challenged a desegregation plan filed with the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW), which the school board was required to implement under the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The plan proposed closure of the Black schools in the county area of the district, creating school attendance zones for most of the 109 schools, and establishing a "freedom-of-choice" plan, under which students were permitted to transfer to any school in the system, provided they could furnish their own transportation and provided the school was not already filled to capacity. According to a 1975 newspaper account of this period, "conveniently enough . . . many schools in affluent white neighborhoods already had a problem with overcrowding."[10]

Closure of the Black schools, the plaintiffs contended, placed the burden of desegregation on Black pupils; further, the school attendance zones, as drawn by the board, would perpetuate racial segregation.

The outcome of the first *Swann* trial was not a victory for the plaintiffs: The federal district court judge ruled that the school board had no affirmative obligation to desegregate the schools. The judge approved the school board plan, imposing only the requirement to desegregate faculty. Plaintiffs appealed, but the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals upheld the

lower court's decision. The appeals court opinion, written by Chief Judge Haynsworth, included this language:

Whatever the Board may do in response to its own initiative or that of the community, we have held that there is no constitutional requirement that it act with the conscious purpose of achieving the maximum mixture of races in the school population. . . . [T]he School Board is under no constitutional requirement that it effectively and completely counteract all the effects of segregated housing patterns. [11]

PRECEDENTIAL DECISIONS

Two Supreme Court decisions in 1968 and 1969 offered new hope to those working to realize the promise of *Brown*. Both of these seemed to be directly applicable to Charlotte-Mecklenburg.

In *Green v. County School Board of New Kent County*,[12] the Court declared that a "freedom-of-choice" plan that seemed on its face to be racially neutral but actually resulted in the perpetuation of racially separate schools was unconstitutional. "The time for mere 'deliberate speed,' has run out," the Court declared. "The burden on a school board today is to come forward with a plan that promises realistically to work, and promises realistically to work *now*."

This tone of urgency was given further emphasis the following year when the Supreme Court, in *Alexander v. Holmes County Board of Education*,[13] reversed a lower court decision granting additional time to certain Mississippi school districts before desegregation plans were to be put into effect. After more than a decade of delay by school boards and district courts, the Supreme Court ruled, "the obligation of every school district is to terminate dual school systems at once and to operate now and hereafter only unitary schools."

SWANN REOPENED

During the 1968-69 school year, some 14,000 of the 24,000 Black students in Charlotte-Mecklenburg still attended schools that were all or predominantly Black. Most of the 24,000 had no white teachers. In April 1969, a motion for further relief re-opened the *Swann* case. This time the case came before a new federal judge, James B. McMillan, who ruled promptly. His order required that all 105 Charlotte-Mecklenburg schools be desegregated, that transportation be used, if necessary, to accomplish this purpose, and that the desegregation plan begin in the fall of 1969, with completion by the fall of 1970.

The findings of fact that influenced Judge McMillan's decision were outlined in a paper he presented in 1981 to the United States Senate Subcommittee on Separation of Powers. Among the findings of fact are those excerpted here:

- **Segregation is caused by government action.** *The*

present location of white schools in white areas and of black schools in black areas is the result of a varied group of elements of public and private action, all deriving their basic strength originally from public law or state or local government action. These elements include among others the legal separation of the races in schools, school busses, public accommodations and housing; racial restrictions in deeds to land; zoning ordinances; city planning; urban renewal; and the actions of the present School Board and others, before and since 1954, in locating and controlling the capacity of schools so that there would usually be black schools handy to black neighborhoods, and white schools for white neighborhoods.

- *Segregation of black children into black schools is* **not** *because of residential patterns, but because of assignment and other policies of the School Board, including the call upon segregated housing and school site selection to lend respectability to those policies.*

- **Segregation impairs student achievement. However, segregation is unlawful regardless of student achievement.** *The uncontradicted evidence before the court is that segregation in Mecklenburg County has produced its inevitable results in the retarded educational achievement and capacity of segregated school children.*

- *Segregation produces inferior education, and it makes little difference whether the school is hot and decrepit or modern and air-conditioned.**

- *It is painfully apparent that "quality education" cannot live in a segregated school;* **segregation itself is the greatest barrier to quality education.**

- **Busing is necessary, legal, cheap, safe, and practical.** *School bussing to* preserve *segregation before* Swann *included average daily bus travel of over forty miles a day and average one-way bus rides of one hour and fifteen minutes . . . [T]ravel distance . . . ordered by the court was shorter than travel times already being required, even of kindergarten students; . . . the cost of transporting the additional students involved was less than the cost of two days of school operation and less than one percent of the annual school budget.*

- **Freedom of choice is in practice a tool of segregation.** *"Freedom of choice" to pick a school bus has never been a right of North Carolina public school students. It has been a*

*Included with the presentation were tables showing sharp disparities in achievement levels between students attending segregated Black and white schools. One such table showed that sixth graders in seven 100 percent Black schools performed at about fourth grade levels, while their counterparts in nine 100 percent white elementary schools performed at fifth to seventh grade levels.

courtesy offered in recent years by some school boards, and its chief effect has been to preserve segregation.

- The use of "bussing," of construction, location, and size of schools, the location of mobile classroom units, the closing of schools and the reassignment of pupils have been tools of segregation and discrimination rather than of desegregation and equal opportunity. *. . . Black schools, including the new black schools, have been located in black areas where busses would be unnecessary. Suburban schools, including the newest ones, have been located far away from black centers, and where they cannot be reached by many students without transportation.*

- Pairing, clustering and grouping of schools are of little help in desegregating schools unless the children have transportation to get to the assigned school.

- "Neighborhood" is not a basis for denying constitutional rights.

- Temporary majorities are not always right. *. . . Civil rights are seldom threatened except by majorities. One whose actions reflect accepted local opinion seldom needs to call upon the Constitution. It is axiomatic that persons claiming constitutional protection are often, for the time being, out of phase with the accepted "right" thinking of their local community. If in such circumstances courts look to public opinion or to political intervention by any other branch of the government instead of to the more stable bulwarks of the Constitution itself, we lose our government of laws, and are back to the government of man, unfettered by law, which our forefathers sought to avoid.*

COMMUNITY CONFLICT

The desegregation of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg schools through court-ordered busing temporarily wrecked this community, but the collision was necessary. . . . We have come a long way since the Concerned Parents Association made bigotry a successful campaign issue.

KEN KOONTZ, former Charlotte journalist

With the publication of the Court's decision in *Swann*, the "school problem" became the center of stormy neighborhood conflict. Angry white citizens came together to form a Concerned Parents Association (CPA), meeting two or three times a week in public schools across the county. Thousands of white citizens attended and were exhorted by their leaders to boycott the schools and to contribute money to the anti-busing cause. A slate of three candidates backed by the CPA ran successfully for election to the School Board in 1970 on an anti-busing slate.[14]

During this period, public school support declined; school

bond issues failed; enrollment in local private schools doubled from 2500 to nearly 5000; private schools began to proliferate. School leaders, their energies expended on fighting the court order, found little time to prepare staff or students for the desegregation experience.

There were some voices of moderation and some supporters of the plan; these included the local ministerial association and the League of Women Voters. County, civic, and business leaders, however, took a hands-off position, leaving school officials to deal with the controversy on their own, with very little community support.

APPEALS, NEGOTIATIONS, SCHOOL CLOSINGS

While white citizen protest dominated the communities of Charlotte-Mecklenburg in 1969 and 1970, legal proceedings dominated the internal affairs of the school system. The initial board reaction to the court order was to declare itself in compliance with the Constitution, refuse to implement a desegregation plan submitted by school superintendent William Self, and move to dismiss the case. These tactics failing, the school board submitted to the court a plan that desegregated the faculties and closed seven Black schools, busing the Black elementary students to suburban white schools.

The court approved the plan, on a temporary basis, for implementation in September 1969. The closure of these schools and the one-way busing of Black students, placing the entire burden of desegregation on the Blacks, left a bitter residue of resentment among Black citizens.

The matter of the desegregation plan to be instituted in 1970 was still not settled. During late 1969 and early 1970, plans were submitted, revised, and resubmitted for approval of the court. In February 1970, approval was given to a plan devised by a court-appointed consultant, Dr. James A. Finger, in which elementary schools would be desegregated by pairing and clustering. A modified school board plan was approved for desegregation of junior and senior high schools.

The *Swann* case was appealed by the school board to the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, and finally to the Supreme Court. Pending the outcome of the appeal, on September 9, 1970, 525 buses (191 more than the year before)* began to roll, transporting students to their first day of attendance in the desegregated public schools of Charlotte-Mecklenburg County.

---

*A 1969 court decision (*Sparrow v. Gill*, 304 F. Supp. 86 (M.D.N.C. 1969)), not related to desegregation, resulted in additional busing for North Carolina children, effective in 1970-71. Prior to that school year, North Carolina law provided that county children who lived more than one and a half miles from school would be provided school bus transportation paid for by the state. City children (defined as those children living within the 1957 boundaries of a city) assigned to schools within the city more than one and a half miles from their homes, were not eligible for state-supported transportation. The court ruling required that if transportation

In April 1971, the Supreme Court, in a unanimous decision, fully affirmed the district court's order, thus opening the way for federal judges across the country to use busing as a tool to remedy officially imposed school segregation. On the point of altering attendance zones to "break up the dual school system," Chief Justice Burger, writing for the Court, stated:

All things being equal, with no history of discrimination, it might well be desirable to assign pupils to schools nearest their homes. But all things are not equal in a system that has been deliberately constructed and maintained to enforce racial segregation. . . .

In these circumstances, we find no basis for holding that the local school authorities may not be required to employ bus transportation as one tool of school desegregation. Desegregation plans cannot be limited to the walk-in school.[15]

The Supreme Court ruling in *Swann*, however, did not yet conclude the litigation in this case. Appeals, desegregation plan revisions and resubmissions, and school board/district court negotiations were to continue until 1975.

SCHOOL KEEPS

We had professional educators in Charlotte-Mecklenburg who were determined that school would keep, that the doors would open on time, that safety would be assured, and that education, even in troubled climates, would go forward. No citizen of this community could cross town late at night and not see with amazement lights on at the Education Center. . . . The guts of the desegregation plan were worked out at the Ed Center by men and women of good faith who had one thing in common. They were professional educators with a commitment to American public education. . . . They were dedicated to the principle that when the doors of each school opened, education would take place.

JEANNE BOHN, director of community affairs
WSOC-TV, Charlotte

During the early days of school desegregation in Charlotte-Mecklenburg, the day-to-day business of running the schools was a crisis-to-crisis business. Central office staff operated a rumor control center to respond to questions of citizens regarding bomb threats and other uncivil disorders,

were provided to any children, it must be provided to all children equally. As a result of the decision, an additional 54,000 students, requiring 549 buses, became eligible for state-funded transportation. In Charlotte-Mecklenburg, it was estimated that 6,000 children would become eligible, requiring 68 additional buses. The *Sparrow* decision complicated any effort to calculate the number of additional buses required for desegregation purposes, since this decision on mileage and extensive school desegregation in North Carolina coincided.

student disruptions and rumored disruptions at the various schools. They staffed a communications center to receive calls from principals and to dispatch intervention task force teams to the various schools when disruptions did occur. The teams, made up of staff from the central administration, remained on call to go to the schools when crises occurred, to walk the halls, to do whatever the principal wanted to be done. The central office staff worked with student and citizen volunteers; they worked with teachers in inservice training programs; they participated in human relations training for themselves and for teachers. And they worked on the constant development, redevelopment, and refinement of desegregation plans.

It was, in fact, a 1973 staff evaluation and report on the desegregation plan then in effect that contributed to a shift in the public mood regarding desegregation. The staff report said that the desegregation program was both unstable and inequitable, that a new round of student transfers would be required in the fall in order to avoid resegregation, and that the greatest impact of busing was being felt by Blacks and by poor and middle-class whites. There were large numbers of exemptions from busing in the affluent white areas.

When this report was released, Blacks and middle-class whites, for the first time, began to join together in their complaints. To the whites, the judge was no longer seen as the villain; rather it was the school board whose actions were unfairly favoring the upper-class whites. Both Black and white citizens no longer demanded an end to busing; instead they began to demand a more equitable and stable busing plan.

THE CITIZENS ADVISORY GROUP

In the summer of '73 the school board was ordered to get public opinion about the busing plan that was to be drawn up that year by the board and submitted to the Court. In response to that order, the school board invited . . . 40 to 50 different representatives to come and speak to them one night in a public hearing. The Quality Education Committee asked me if I would consider getting that group together before they spoke to the board, to see if there would be any consensus. . . . And I agreed to do that. I thought it would maybe be a one-night stand. It turned out to be about a year's worth of work.

MAGGIE RAY, Charlotte-Mecklenburg classroom teacher, former chair, Citizens Advisory Committee

JULIUS LEVONNE CHAMBERS, ESQ., Legal Counsel for plaintiffs in *Swann*

School desegregation in Charlotte-Mecklenburg began with community involvement and was often disrupted by the intense, sometimes violent, emotionalism of that involvement. But when the desegregation plan was actually carried out, and when the long court battle was finally played out, open hostilities began to recede. As the traumas of school desegregation began to be replaced by its achievements, it was

the community—this time healing in its influence—that contributed powerfully to those achievements.

The desegregation plan that Judge McMillan approved in 1974 is basically the one in place today. It was a product of the joint effort of school administrative staff and a Citizens Advisory Group, whose 25 members were appointed by the board to represent a broad range of community viewpoints toward education, desegregation, and busing. The core membership of this group came from citizens advisory committees elected by the parent teacher associations of the 10 high school areas in the district.

At the first meeting of the group that was to become the Citizens Advisory Group (CAG), Blacks and whites, pro- and anti-busing, conservatives and liberals, worked together, under the leadership of a classroom teacher, Maggie Ray, and another community leader, now a school board member, Elizabeth Bennett, to decide what were the elements then missing and most crucially needed in a pupil assignment plan. The group found that, while there were many divergent views among them, they all agreed on two priorities: fairness and stability, both qualities lacking in the plan and both essential to a successful plan. They wanted the plan to be fair; they wanted no more favoritism toward the white and wealthy. And they did not want the perpetual changing of school assignments year after year.

After presenting their views to the school board, leaders of the group offered their services as a community resource to the school system in the final shaping of a desegregation plan for submission to the court. The board accepted. Maggie Ray described what happened next:

. . .[W]e then began a series of meetings which were rather miraculous, I guess. We sat down around a table in the administration center. They gave us this little crowded room in between file cabinets, so we were bodily all close together. So we had to act nice, be polite. . . . [W]e hassled out over a period of about six weeks some guidelines that we thought the board should follow, five with regard to fairness and five with regard to stability. And we presented these to the board . . . and the board said, "Thank you very much and here is our plan," which they had been drawing up this whole time. The plan did not address, we felt, the issues that were before the court and were causing friction and causing the upheavals year after year.

So, rather discouraged, we met again and decided our only alternative was to draw up our own plan. And we had, of course, at this point no support from the board, but the judge entered an order that the board would help us in any way it could. And I think this was probably a very crucial point in what ended up being our very powerful position. In a way we became a referee for the court between the school board and the judge.

Judge McMillan told the NEA Inquiry Panel of the "happy accident" that brought the Citizens Advisory Group into the orbit of *Swann*:

. . .I decided that perhaps this group, some of whose recommendations had been printed in the paper, would be well to act as a go-between between the court and the board. So I was sitting in my office one afternoon dictating an order and I got down to the last paragraph of it, which said, "That, therefore, the Citizens Advisory Group be requested to let the court know whether they would be willing to take on the job of recommending a pupil assignment program which would bridge all the factual and other difficulties that now exist."

And my secretary buzzed my phone and said, "Miss Ray is out here to see you." And I said, "Send her in." So I asked her to sit down while I completed the sentence, asking her and Betsy Bennett's committee to work up a plan with the assistance of the school staff and present it to the court.

. . .[T]hey worked up a plan which is the core of the pupil assignment plan today. That made it possible for the board to withdraw gracefully from the war. And made it possible for me to approve the plan, which was good in the principles and in fact. And we haven't had any more litigation between the board and the plaintiff since.

. . .I call that serendipity. . . . I'd say that that group, more than any other single factor, bridged the gap and brought the controversy to a close.

PROJECT ARIES

We had concerned and courageous students; and believe me, it was very difficult for many of these students because they did not have support from their parents. They had other students, white students, calling them nigger lovers; and Black students calling them Uncle Toms, and people would give them a hard time. But, basically, Project Aries was a students' program. It was the idea of two students, when we were having riots in our schools, who wanted to do something positive. They felt that students could have a greater influence on other students than adults could. . . .

KITTY HUFFMAN, former regional director,
National Conference of Christians and Jews

Project Aries mainly dealt with the interaction among the races . . . we were allowed the opportunity to view differences and talk about things that made us different and things that were going to make us work together better. . . . I realized that some of the skills I was taught were some of the things it was going to take in order to be president of some of the organizations at school.

GEORGE DUNLAP, former Charlotte-Mecklenburg student and staff member, Project Aries, now school resource officer, Charlotte Police Department

From 1972 to 1982, there flourished in Charlotte-Mecklenburg public schools an integrated program that helped students—Black and white—to respect and appreciate each others' cultural differences, to develop skills that would enable them to contribute as leaders in class and extracurricular activities; and to help their peers, teachers, and parents deal more sensitively and effectively with the complexities of a racially integrated school experience. The program, called Project Aries, was originated and led by students. It was sponsored by two community organizations, the National Conference of Christians and Jews and the 4-H Club. It was funded by grants under the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA), enacted by the U.S. Congress in 1972 to support school system desegregation efforts. It was halted when ESAA funds were effectively eliminated under the block grant provisions of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981.

During the 10 years of its operation, Project Aries involved junior and senior high school students in human relations, leadership skills, and personal growth training at week-end and week-long retreats, and assisted them in conducting training workshops for other students, and for their parents and teachers within school settings. Each junior and senior high school in the system had a Project Aries group. Leaders of the program, talking with the NEA Inquiry Panel, expressed the view that Project Aries played a centrally important role in making desegregation work. The students, by their own example, demonstrated that people of different races and cultures could work effectively together. Other organizations in the schools called upon Project Aries members to conduct training, brainstorming sessions, and various human relations programs. It was the only organization within the schools that had a wide range of resources that could be used by other groups.

The NEA panel learned while in Charlotte that United Way funds would be made available to help restore Project Aries programs, but only at the junior high level.

DOROTHY COUNTS SCOGGINS (left) and BEVERLY GLOVER LOGAN; both former students of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg public schools.

GETHSEMANE ENRICHMENT PROGRAM AND BETHLEHEM CENTER

We were very excited when the Charlotte-Mecklenburg school system started its massive desegregation process, but we were also deeply concerned about the problems that we knew would be experienced when people of different cultures came together for the first time. . . . [T]here were many instances in the early days . . . when white teachers had difficulty understanding some Black students and vice versa. We listened daily to the concerns of the neighborhood parents whose children were going to be bused many miles away from home. Many of these parents did not have cars, and they were worried about such

From left to right: CARRIE WINTER, chair of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education; KEITH HOWEY, president of Charlotte-Mecklenburg Association of Educators; and DR. K.Z. CHAVIS, executive secretary, North Carolina Association of Educators.

matters as what would happen if their child got sick and they could not get him or her home, and how they, as parents, could be a part of the educational process if they could not get to PTA meetings and other school activities.

There were many, many problems . . . which could easily have made the massive integration of our school system a dismal failure. However, a tremendous amount of work on the part of the school officials, teachers, students, community leaders, and neighborhood organizations like ourselves had made the system work, although some of these problems still exist.

ADELAIDE HUNT, Gethsemane AME Enrichment Program

The Gethsemane Enrichment Program and Bethlehem Center are both nonprofit human service agencies that serve low income, minority neighborhoods. The major thrust of the two programs is to bridge the communications and education gap between the schools, the parents and their communities. The services that the two agencies have offered include counseling students with absentee and behavior problems, working to increase parent involvement in the school system, making home visits, tutoring students, providing after school activities and day care programs, offering parenting workshops, and operating the Head Start Program for Mecklenburg County.

These programs too have received Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) funding in the past. Now that the federal funds have dried up, these necessary services have been sharply curtailed. When the ESAA support was available, the Bethlehem Center had staff persons assigned to as many as 21 schools. These staff persons—community liaison workers—saw to it that the parents got to the PTA meetings and participated in school activities; and they provided varied services to bring the parents and neighborhoods closer to the schools. The school liaison program failed to survive the loss of federal funding; the need for such programs did not recede with their curtailment.

THE BUSINESS COMMUNITY

I have looked at a lot of school systems across the country . . . [W]e have got absolutely the best school system in these United States, and I know we have the best superintendent; and . . . I will say to you that any school system that isn't doing what . . . ought to be done ought to get about it because they can make progress. As you know, we elected . . . a Black mayor the other day, and we are proud of him. He is a fine man. He is going to lead us. I would say to you prior to school integration, we couldn't have done that, regardless of how good he was. . . . [W]e have grown tremendously.

W.T. HARRIS, former chair of the Mecklenburg Board of County Commissioners

During the early turbulent days of court-ordered busing in Charlotte, the desegregation effort was a cause not widely supported by civic and business leaders. Although here, as in communities across the land, the public schools were being asked to do what no other institutions had been willing to do, they were generally left to succeed, or fail, in that effort on their own.

When the litigation had run its course, however, and all the appeals had failed, the message became clear: The constitutional mandate could no longer be avoided. And the political climate of the community began to change. The chair of the Board of County Commissioners, W.T. Harris, in 1973, decided that the time had come for the school system to remove itself from the stewardship of the court. He conferred with Judge McMillan and asked him what it would take to get him out of the school business. The judge answered that all it would take would be a school board that would obey the law of the land. The commissioner then conferred with the chair of the school board and asked how they could go about getting this accomplished. Although the chair of the Board of County Commissioners did not involve himself openly in the election process, a few phone calls to Democratic Party leaders in the community led ultimately to the election of a new school board majority whose members were ready to comply with the law and get on with the business of education.

With the changing of the board's membership, there came a slow changing of the public mood and an invigorated leadership from the business community. The Chamber of Commerce established an Education Task Force Committee; that committee then set out to have every one of the 40 Chamber of Commerce board members visit an elementary, junior high and senior high school. James Babb, a Charlotte broadcasting executive and the chair of the Chamber of Commerce Education Task Force in 1973, told the panel what happened when the business leaders acquainted themselves with the schools—with the media leading the way:

. . .[O]nce these business leaders got into the schools and saw good things going on. . . . I think we had a complete turn around in attitude. . . . We kicked off the opening of school week with a week-long series of programs focused on education. . . . We had public meetings, we did television programs. . . . We had seminars afterwards with participants, to show people what was going on. . . I think the business community took a very responsible position. . . . I do think there was a reservoir of good will in the community that . . . transcended any feelings about busing. The community simply said, "Let's get on with it."

Charlotte-Mecklenburg public schools did get on with it. In 1977, the school system employed a new superintendent, Dr. Jay Robinson, whose effectiveness as a school leader was

endorsed by all of the Charlotte citizens who met with the NEA Inquiry Panel. In his testimony to the panel, Dr. Robinson said:

In my opinion school integration has significantly contributed to good race relations and to the overall quality of life in Charlotte and Mecklenburg County. Busing children from their neighborhoods to schools in other areas of the county in order to improve racial balance in schools will probably always bring opposition. However, I know of no other way to integrate schools until neighborhoods become more integrated. I believe our community is a better place to live; and the overall quality of our schools is better today than it would have been if the Swann *decision had not been made.*

Austin: *"Making It Work . . . For Kids' Sake!"*

In the last 30 years Austin has attempted, at times clumsily, and at times crisply and compassionately, to deal with the issues of integrating our schools and our community.

GUS GARCIA, former school board member, Austin Independent School District

The first small steps toward the lowering of racial barriers in the Austin Independent School District (AISD) took place here, as they did in Charlotte-Mecklenburg, prior to court intervention. From the time of its establishment in 1881, until 1955, the year after *Brown*, the AISD operated a dual school system for Black and white students. Separate schools were also provided for most Hispanic students, although they were not officially accorded separate—or any—racial classification. The 1876 Texas Constitution required local school districts to provide separate schools "for the white and colored children," but was silent with regard to the education of Hispanic children:

At the turn of the century, school district policies lacked consistency because all followed the theory that elected bodies could be final arbiters of constitutional requirements. But they were faced with a dilemma—some semblance of education had to be provided, but where—the black or the white schools? Thus, Chicanos were forced into a limbo of separate schools without the sanction of state statute, but under the aegis of state law. Chicano segregation, a peculiar institution rooted in local government law, was a hybrid school desegregation that existed as long as Southern black segregation.[16]

The applicability of *Brown* to Hispanic students* was a

*A number of Texas cities classified Mexican Americans as "white" in their initial desegregation activities during the 1960s. The result was

central issue in the long court battle to desegregate Austin's public schools. Hispanic students had not been designated as a separate racial group; thus, the school system claimed, their concentration in a few separate schools was not a product of official segregative policy, but of the system's benign effort to place Hispanic schools in locations convenient to Hispanic neighborhoods.

The anomalous position of the Chicano—not white, yet not, in old-style parlance, 'colored'—has been one of the roots of the Chicano tragedy in this country. It has produced a history of legal struggle for equal educational opportunity that has been as difficult as, but at the same time significantly different from, that waged by black Americans.[17]

SEPARATE HOUSING, SEPARATE SCHOOLS

In 1967, when I moved to Austin, I noticed on the school boundary maps that there were two cigar-shaped school districts. These were in the east part of town. One . . . had a school located in the far east end of it and that school was Johnston High and was primarily to serve Mexican American students.

The other school district, which is also cigar-shaped right above it, was Anderson High School, designed to serve primarily Black Austin students. It seemed very curious to me that all the rest of the schools in the city had somewhat circular boundaries. . .

LARRY DEUSER, former officer,
Austin Alliance for a Smooth Transition

The Black and Hispanic populations of this tri-ethnic community historically have been concentrated in an area known as East Austin, Blacks populating the northern section of East Austin and Hispanics the southern section. The entire area is separated from the remainder of the city by a major interstate highway and the downtown area to the west; and by Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard to the north. Historically, the segregated neighborhoods of East Austin have been served by segregated neighborhood schools. Near clusters of Blacks and Hispanics in other areas of the city, elementary schools were built to serve those minority children.

In the earliest years after *Brown*, even though Hispanics (then as now) comprised a larger proportion of the city and school population than did Blacks, the issues of desegregation centered on the Black student.

During the 1954-55 school year, the AISD operated one all-Black high school, Anderson High School; one all-Black junior high school, Kealing Junior High; and seven all-Black elementary schools, three of which were located in East

"desegregated" schools in some cases with predominantly or totally minority (Black and Hispanic) students. Such practices led to changes in federal policy to recognize the rights of "national origin minorities."

Austin. The remaining four elementary schools served small Black communities scattered in other parts of the district.

The attendance zones of Anderson High School and Kealing Junior High School were almost identical to the boundaries of Black East Austin.

THE BEGINNINGS OF DESEGREGATION

Starting at the high school level in 1955, the AISD introduced a grade-a-year desegregation plan, permitting Black students to transfer to schools in their own neighborhoods. Initially this meant that Black students in other sections of the city were no longer required to go all the way across town to attend the one all-Black high school in East Austin. By 1963, the plan had been extended to include all grade levels.

In 1967, the system adopted a "freedom-of-choice" policy for all secondary students. Black students living in East Austin could transfer to white secondary schools in other parts of the city; and white students could transfer to Anderson and Kealing in East Austin. Very few Blacks, and no whites, took advantage of this choice.

ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS; REFERRAL TO JUSTICE

Both Anderson and Kealing were still all Black in 1968, when a survey team from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) came into the district and found it to be out of compliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964 "for failure to eliminate all remaining vestiges of the dual school system." The HEW team found that "freedom-of-choice" acted to avert rather than facilitate desegregation. Black students living anywhere in the city could still attend all-Black East Austin schools; white students living in East Austin could transfer to white schools outside of that attendance zone.

This policy was changed in 1969-70, so that only Black students could transfer out of the East Austin area. Very few whites resided in East Austin by that time, however; so, with no white students transferring in, the student population of Anderson and Kealing Schools remained nearly 100 percent Black until they were closed by order of the district court in 1971.

In the summer of 1970, after more than a year of AISD-HEW negotiations, and repeated rejections of desegregation plans submitted by the district, a hearing was held on the HEW charge of noncompliance; at its conclusion the HEW hearing officer declared that the district had indeed failed to comply with the law. The matter then went to the United States Department of Justice for enforcement; and a decade of litigation began.

In its lawsuit filed with the Federal District Court in

August 1970, the Justice Department charged the AISD with operating a dual school system based on race, and with discriminatorily assigning Mexican American students to schools identifiable as Mexican American schools or as schools intended only for Black and Mexican American students.

At the time the suit was filed, there were 18 schools in East Austin with greater than 90 percent combined enrollment of Black and Mexican American students. These 18 East Austin schools enrolled 77 percent of the city's Black students and 59 percent of the Hispanic students.[18]

THE INTERIM ORDER

An interim district court order, issued in August 1970, required the AISD to move more effectively to desegregate faculty and staff, and to ensure that school construction plans be designed to advance desegregation of the system. A second part of that order had results that are recalled bitterly today by Black citizens of Austin. The district court judge ordered closure of a Black elementary school in North Austin and the dispersal of its students to surrounding predominantly white schools. He further ordered that the boundaries of Anderson High School be rotated to the north to encompass an adjoining white neighborhood. White students from that neighborhood were then assigned to attend Anderson when school opened that fall.

The Anderson students and faculty made extensive preparations, sprucing up the school and getting it ready to welcome the white students. But they prepared a reception to which no one came. On the first day of school, no white students showed up. And in this instance when the law was defied, the law retreated. The judge rescinded his order and restored the Anderson High School attendance zone to its former racially drawn boundaries.

RULINGS AND REVERSALS

For 10 years, from the 1970 interim order to 1980, the AISD desegregation case traversed the federal court system several times. The final court decision, ordering a tri-ethnic desegregation plan, was issued November 5, 1979; the consent decree was signed in January 1980. Here is the itinerary of these measures.

Shortly after the *Swann* decision, in June 1971, the federal district court in Austin held a full hearing on the AISD desegregation case. Finding that vestiges of the dual school system still survived, the court approved a desegregation plan proposed by the school system, which involved closing Anderson High School and Kealing Junior High School and assigning their students to predominantly white schools. A second part of the plan provided for a kind of part-time desegregation of elementary schools through the estab-

lishment of tri-ethnic learning centers in different subject areas at four different schools.

In a significant holding, the district court further held that Mexican American students constituted a separate, identifiable ethnic minority, but that the Austin schools had not practiced *de jure* discrimination against Mexican Americans.*

The Department of Justice appealed this decision to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. As the appeal was going forward, the NAACP Legal Defense Fund and the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) joined the suit as plaintiff intervenors.

In 1972, the full membership of the Fifth Circuit Court reversed the district court's limitation, ruling that "discriminatory segregation exists against Mexican American students and that the proposed part-time desegregation of the school district is inadequate as a desegregation plan."[19] It sent the case back to the district court.

LINES OF LAST RESISTANCE

The Fifth Circuit's 1972 reversal did not end the case. Among the subsequent court actions were these:

- **August 1, 1973.** After hearings, the district court again found that the Austin schools had not unconstitutionally segregated Mexican American students; approved a plan for one-way busing of Black students to desegregate Black secondary schools; and approved a plan for sixth grade centers, permitting elementary students below sixth grade to attend neighborhood schools.

- **May 13, 1976.** Upon appeal by plaintiffs and plantiff-intervenors, the Fifth Circuit reversed again and held: "...school authorities may not constitutionally use a neighborhood assignment policy that creates segregated schools in a district with ethnically segregated residential patterns. A segregated school system is the foreseeable and inevitable result of such an assignment policy."[20]

- **June 9, 1976.** The Fifth Circuit denied an Austin Board of Education request for a rehearing and the board sought review by the U.S. Supreme court.

- **July 2, 1976.** In response to the Fifth Circuit's reversal, the federal district court judge appointed a tri-ethnic committee composed of 22 Austin citizens, to aid in the formation and implementation of a comprehensive desegregation plan for the AISD.

- **December 6, 1976.** The Supreme Court vacated the Fifth Circuit's decision and, without opinion, remanded the

*The trial judge reasoned that the ethnic segregation of Mexican American schools was the result of changing residential patterns and of the school system's "historically honored" neighborhood school concept.

case for reconsideration in light of its recent ruling in another case.*

- **November 21, 1977.** After reconsideration of its decision, the Fifth Circuit reaffirmed its 1973 judgment, remanding the case for a full rehearing and for resubmission and court approval of a comprehensive tri-ethnic desegregation plan.

- **September 7, 1978.** The Fifth Circuit denied an appeal of the Austin school board for a rehearing and the board filed again for Supreme Court review.

- **July 2, 1979.** The Supreme Court refused to hear the case.

- **July 11 to July 27, 1979.** The district court held hearings.

- **November 5, 1979.** The district court judge ordered the AISD to submit a tri-ethnic desegregation plan.

- **January 2, 1980.** The district court approved the consent decree submitted by the four parties: AISD, Department of Justice, NAACP Legal Defense Fund, and MALDEF.

- **June 27, 1983.** The district court judge, with agreement of all parties, declared the AISD a unitary school system and terminated jurisdiction of the case.

THE COURT ORDER

In his November 5, 1979 order, the district court judge required that the tri-ethnic desegregation plan aim to achieve a white enrollment in each school in "rough proportion" to the percentage of white students in the district. The judge suggested that the white enrollment in each school be targeted at 45 to 65 percent:

The Court emphasizes that this Anglo-majority standard is a goal, but not an absolute requirement. If there are integrated neighborhoods where compact attendance zones can be drawn which will produce a fair balance of Anglos and minority students, some deviation from the standard may be acceptable. Some deviation from the standard also may be permitted in deference to other practical considerations, and

*In *Washington v. Davis*, 426 U.S. 229 (1976), the Supreme Court reversed the decision of a lower court that an employment test was unconstitutional if it was not job related and if a significantly higher proportion of Blacks than whites failed the test. The trial court said this was true even if the test was racially neutral on its face and was not intended to discriminate. In its reversal, the Supreme Court held that disproportionate racial impact, while not irrelevant, is not sufficient evidence of racial discrimination absent a showing of discriminatory racial purpose. The result of this action was to bring into question a number of school desegregation cases in which the *effects* of schools' practices had increased discrimination, while the *intent* to do so had not been clearly established.

the Court may even find acceptable the continued existence of "essentially one-race schools resulting from geographic or demographic accidents and surviving as minor anomalies in a broadly integrated program." [21]

The court did not specify the contents of the plan, but suggested as possible tools in the desegregation effort the alteration of attendance zones, the pairing and clustering of schools, and centrally located grade or multiple-grade centers, such as the sixth-grade centers established by an earlier court order.

The parties to the suit were urged to consult with one another and attempt to agree upon an acceptable desegregation plan "which promises realistically to work now."

THE CONSENT DECREE

The desegregation plan that had been forged in the heat of conflict during 10 years of litigation was finally shaped through negotiation and compromise among the parties involved, and monitored by a court-appointed committee representing a cross-section of Austin's tri-ethnic school community.

We really began working on a plan during the trial . . . we . . . started negotiating in March of 1978 and negotiated right up through the trial and past the trial. . . .

We thought we would win and plaintiffs thought they would win and it was a four-party negotiation among the district, the Justice Department, MALDEF and NAACP [Legal Defense Fund]. . . .

Judge Roberts had insisted all along from 1970 that the best approach was to come up with an agreed settlement to the case. And, really, what we did was trade.

DAN ROBERTSON, desegregation specialist,
Austin Independent School District

Part of the trading that resulted in the 1980 consent decree involved a pledge by the AISD to build a school in East Austin to replace Kealing, the junior high school that had been closed in 1971. A new high school named Anderson had been built in 1973 in the affluent northwestern area of the district.

The loss to the Black community of these two East Austin schools had been a bitter blow, because of its real effects—among them, the loss of all vestiges of school identity—trophies, clubs, colors, athletic teams—and the hardship of being treated as "outsiders" in predominantly white schools. The loss was resented also because of its symbolic message—that the victims of injustice would be required to pay the heaviest price of remedy.

The consent decree stipulated in effect, that the AISD would:

- study the impact of proposed boundary changes and new school construction upon the racial and ethnic makeup of schools within the district and consider any educationally feasible alternatives that would maximize integration
- retain its current majority to minority transfer option, with transportation provided to students who exercise that option (an option permitting students who are attending schools in which their race is in the majority to transfer to any school where their race is in the minority)
- continue to seek and implement programs designed to meet the special needs of children who must overcome educational deficiencies
- continue to give high priority to maintenance of an educationally effective bilingual education program
- continue affirmative action recruitment and employment efforts.

Other stipulations provided that:

- Plaintiffs or plaintiff intervenors would be entitled to a court hearing to show why the case should be reopened if there were any substantial change in the AISD student assignment plan that would unlawfully discriminate against students.
- The Tri-Ethnic Committee was to monitor implementation of the plan as long as the court retained jurisdiction of the case.
- Pending good faith implementation of the desegregation plan, at the end of three years, the district court would terminate its jurisdiction of the case and would declare the AISD a unitary school system.

"HELL NO, WE WON'T GO!"

The news that for the first time white students would share in court-ordered busing was not greeted quietly by some of their parents. A citizens group called Action for Neighborhood Schools began to organize, locally and in coordination with national anti-busing leaders, to try to end the use of busing for school desegregation. As in Charlotte, anti-busing rallies were held, attracting standing-room-only crowds of placard-bearing desegregation opponents. At one such meeting reported in the press in December 1979, "a crowd of about 1800" heard busing defined by a University of Texas law professor as "a gross misbehavior on the part of the courts"—

The U.S. Constitution . . . is not a moral obligation to commit suicide. . . . You are under no obligation to go along

with this. . . . Busing can be stopped, if we all go together and stop it. . . .

"There is no law that will make Anderson High School kids be bused across town to Johnston. Parents just won't stand for that."[22]

Some of the white high school students, following the example of their elders, made headlines with their own marches and rallies:

A restless crowd of approximately 300 Anderson High School students stormed the Carruth Administration Building this morning, waving anti-busing signs, chanting, "Hell no, we won't go!" and vowing not to comply with a court order which would force them to change schools in early 1980.

An Anderson mother . . . said, "Our protest doesn't have anything to do with racism. It's not a matter of integration that we're upset about. Busing is unconstitutional."[23]

The Black and Hispanic citizens of East Austin, too, were far from unanimous in their approval of the new desegregation plan. Their children—particularly the Black children—had always borne the burden of court-ordered busing. Thus, the latest plan was met with considerable distrust by East Austin citizens. At public meetings, they voiced concern about the fate of bilingual programs as a result of further student dispersal; and they expressed resentment at the attitudes of North Austin residents toward East Austin schools.

But in many of the schools on both sides of town, principals, teachers, students, and parents were beginning to learn about each other, through school visits, meetings, and various shared activities to ease the way toward the next September.

"WE CAN MAKE IT WORK . . . FOR KIDS' SAKE!"

. . . it's immoral for society to request its children to do something and then withhold support. . . . These children didn't ask to be reassigned. We're asking the children to do something the adults should have done and didn't. And it's not fair, when you do that, to withhold your support.

JOHN ELLIS, superintendent,
Austin Independent School District

The Austin school system system had approached the mandate of *Brown* with a great deal more deliberation than speed. Nevertheless, once the final word came down—despite the initial rites of protest—school officials, the staff, and the community came together with extraordinary strength and unity of purpose to turn a court defeat into an educational victory.

While anti-busing protest groups were attempting to turn

back the tide of events, other organizations throughout the city were mobilizing their resources to support the desegregation effort. Some of those groups and what they did to make desegregation work in Austin are described here.

The **Austin Association of Teachers (AAT)** took public positions supporting the establishment of a unitary school system throughout the 1970s. During these years the Association conducted human relations workshops for its own members to help prepare them for the time when they would be working together in desegregated schools and classrooms. In 1979, the year the final desegregation order came down, the three top leaders of the Association—Lucille Crawford, the president, Black; Annette Cootes, the executive director, white; and Al Perez, the associate director, Hispanic—were representative of their tri-ethnic school community. That year the AAT Faculty Senate, at the recommendation of its president and staff, adopted a statement calling on the Austin school board, faculty, staff, parents, students and community to "join together to prepare and implement a desegregation plan in a spirit of neighborliness, racial justice, and sound educational practice."

The Association called on business, academic, and church leaders to form an advisory committee to cooperate with the AAT in what would be an extensive campaign in support of the desegregation plan.

On December 7, 1979, the AAT held a press conference to announce its "campaign for togetherness" to promote harmonious desegregation of Austin public schools. The slogan created by the AAT to launch the campaign—'We Can Make it Work . . . for Kids' Sake!"—was to become the unifying theme of Austin's community-wide desegregation effort. Promotional materials to advance the campaign included posters, bumper stickers, and radio and television announcements, which the broadcast media ran as a public service. The message that the AAT broadcast to the people of Austin was this:

Learning about people is just as important as learning about science; and learning to love is easier than learning to hate. Parents and teachers can do much to shape the future of our children and our city. Let's keep our kids in Austin public schools. They will thank us later. Together we can make it work . . . for kids' sake!

The Austin Alliance for a Smooth Transition, a coalition spearheaded by the Austin League of Women Voters in 1977, brought together a large number of community groups for the purpose of rallying public support for desegregation from all ethnic segments of the city. In June 1976, the League convened a general meeting of concerned and sympathetic organizations to establish the Alliance and to set its goals. Among the participating groups were the Council for Chris-

tians and Jews, the Travis County Democratic Women, Bring East Austin Together, NAACP, Mexican American Chamber of Commerce, Board of the American Association of University Professors at the University of Texas, AISD school board members, City Council of PTAs, the Women's Political Caucus, and the Mexican American Business and Professional Women's Association.

The projects and activities of the Alliance included these important contributions to the school desegregation effort:

- a comprehensive resource bank containing extensive desegregation-related materials for use by churches, students, parents, and community groups
- a monthly newsletter and fact sheets presenting factual information about local and national desegregation topics
- a 30-minute monthly TV program that explored local desegregation and education issues and related topics, broadcast on local cable
- a speakers bureau
- counseling of individuals and groups of parents and acting as liaison between AISD, the schools, and parents
- cooperation with the League of Women Voters and the City Council of PTAs to mount a campaign to get employers in the Austin area to give their employees time off with pay to attend their children's parent-teacher conferences.

Initial support for the Alliance came from local contributions. Later, after qualifying for funding as a nonprofit organization, the Alliance was supported by federal ESAA funds, until it disbanded in 1980.

City Council PTA, an umbrella organization for all the PTAs in the Austin school system, worked through various activities of its local PTAs to foster parental support of the desegregation plan. In cooperation with school principals and teachers, the PTAs arranged for parental visits of the schools to which their children would be assigned. They set up joint PTA executive boards of the paired schools. They encouraged the establishment of PTAs at all the schools in order to build and sustain strong parent support of the desegregated programs.

Here, again, was an organization of volunteers that served as a vital information link between the schools and the parents of Austin. It was also a source of school volunteer help in the schools and in the central administrative office.

Ministerial Coalitions took an active role within their churches and their communities, making public their support of school desegregation in Austin. The Catholic Bishop made clear to the public that the Catholic schools would not be used as a haven for white flight. To ensure that this did not happen, enrollment in these schools was frozen so that no

new students would be admitted during the first year of desegregation. Ministers of all faiths designated a Sunday when it was agreed that they would talk about the desegregation issue and stress compliance with the law and the message of the kinship of all humankind. Further, some of the churches were made available as locations for students on late after-school buses to be dropped off, after taking part in extracurricular activities. The students could wait at the churches for their parents to pick them up.

The Business Community actively involved itself in desegregation issues when it became evident that strong, organized, and perhaps violent anti-busing forces were coalescing in the city. Realizing that a crisis situation might be brewing, 10 to 15 business leaders began meeting informally to discuss ways in which peaceful compliance with the court order could be promoted. They recognized that broad community involvement would be the key to achieving successful and harmonious desegregation. Acting on that decision in cooperation with several community organizations, the business group issued 400 invitations to leaders in various segments of the community asking them to come together to sound a note of unity in support of the school system's desegregation effort.

At the meeting, billed as a Rally for Smoothness in School Desegregation, the several hundred persons attending joined in signing a resolution proclaiming Austin as a city of law abiding citizens, dedicated to successful implementation of the student assignment plan of the AISD.

The recognized slogan of the community's campaign to support desegregation was the AAT's theme—"We can make it work. . . for kids' sake!"

THE PLAN IS IMPLEMENTED

My task as I saw it then was to mobilize the entire community behind the schools in an exceptionally supportive way and then . . . to help motivate the staff to just outdo themselves in ensuring that the plan was implemented.

JOHN ELLIS, superintendent,
Austin Independent School District

Several persons who met with the NEA Inquiry Panel suggested that the lessons learned and the experience gained during the troubled decade of the '70s served as essential preparation for the "big move" in 1980.

Some of these lessons were learned at a great cost to a great many students and teachers—particularly to minority students and teachers.

The closing of Black schools; the unilateral reassignment of minority students, placing them always in the role of intruders in the white schools; the early failure to prepare students and staff adequately for the desegregation experi-

ence—mistakes made during these years taught Austin school staff what not to do in desegregating the schools.

But there were positive experiences during these years as well. The establishment of the sixth grade centers was only a part-time desegregation effort; and like all earlier desegregation efforts, it involved only the one-way transportation of East Austin students to the school centers in other parts of the city. But faculties were integrated in these schools; and the educational programs and materials were outstanding, teachers and principals testified. Federally funded human relations training, extra materials, and compensatory education programs were all provided to give the desegregation effort every possible opportunity for success. According to several former principals of sixth grade centers, the experience there laid some important groundwork for the task of directing the tri-ethnic pupil assignment plan in 1980.

Leading that comprehensive desegregation effort and, according to many who talked with the NEA panel, a central figure in its successful implementation, was a new superintendent, John Ellis, who came to the district in May 1980. Like Superintendent Jay Robinson in Charlotte, Dr. Ellis has been a strong and positive educational leader, who has been able to reach out effectively to the community, inspiring trust, respect and cooperation.

Under his direction, the staff of the AISD has carried out numerous programs to facilitate the desegregation program. At the time of the greatest mass movement of teachers in 1980, the district conducted extensive human relations training programs. A desegregation communications center was set up to coordinate communication between the school district and the community, between parents who were fearful of what was happening to their children, and the AISD staff. Telephone hot lines were available to parents who had questions and concerns, or who simply wanted to complain. The school system maintained continuing contact with the media; during the times of greatest tension when the plan was going into effect, press conferences were conducted every day.

Community support of the school system was encouraged by the use of volunteers throughout the school system. School community liaison representatives were employed to establish stronger bonds between school and community.

Early and late buses were put in service to transport students to before and after school extracurricular activities; bus monitors were employed to ensure the security of the younger students. Animal decals were used on buses for kindergarten through third grade, to help students identify their buses.

Most of the programs designed to make desegregation work more effectively, and to help ensure that educational quality would not be sacrificed in the process were funded by

the federal Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA). Because those funds have been terminated under the present federal Administration, many important programs have had to be curtailed or eliminated entirely.

"FORMING THE FUTURE"

Parent-citizen involvement in the schools . . . had been something that had not been occurring very actively until after the Brown *decision; and then everybody suddenly decided the schools belonged to them again.*

JANE WELLS, community leader, former education committee chair "Forming the Future"

A project to keep the public aware of its proprietary stake in public education, and to chart a course for the future of Austin's public schools was recently completed. It involved over 14,000 people from all segments of the Austin school community, gathered together in committees and task forces, examining every aspect of the public school operation. The responsibility of the various teams was to examine the *status quo* of education in the district, to determine what things need to be done to reinforce the strengths of the system, what needs to be done to eliminate its weaknesses; and to set priorities for immediate attention, and for longer term consideration. The culmination of this project was a report entitled "Forming the Future."

The undertaking of the project itself could serve as a model of substantive community involvement in public education. The report is a comprehensive and thorough analysis of the school in this community. Perhaps most important, the relationships formed between the AISD and its constituency as this work was getting done can have a long-term bonding effect between the people who have worked together and the schools serving them.

Oddly, there is one missing topic in the "Forming the Future" report, considering the experience that this community has recently shared. Nowhere in the report are the words "desegregation" or "integration" mentioned. Is this because the community believes that desegregation issues have been resolved, and integration has been achieved? Or is it because the words bring up issues that remain too divisive to be mentioned in what perhaps was meant to be a healing venture?

A MATTER OF EQUITY

Although desegregation may be in the minds of some an issue whose time has passed, it remains very much an important concern to those who have personally experienced what it means, in simple terms of equity.

Richard Kouri, president of the Austin Association of Teachers, is one such person. In 1980 he was transferred from the predominantly white Anderson High School in Northwestern Austin to the predominantly minority Johnston High School in East Austin. Telling of that experience he expressed the reality of desegregation in words that bear repeating here:

I believed in desegregation in a kind of—what was then a traditional liberal response. I believed it was good that we should have desegregated schools and that different races should be in the same building. And it wasn't until that transfer that I realized the issue was really equity (and that it wasn't just a social issue.)

The difference between those two schools in terms of equipment and resources . . . astounded me. It was a tale of two cities; I felt as if I had been transferred to a different school district.

And I wanted this committee to hear from someone who said this district did not treat all of its students equitably until a federal court stepped in and made them do it. I went from a school that had more equipment for one department . . . more equipment for the English Department at Anderson High School . . . than there was for the entire staff at Johnston High School.

That kind of reality made me appreciate what the judge said in the Brown *decision about separate but equal being inherently unequal and inherently unfair. . . .*

I did want to take the opportunity to say, as a teacher and as the president of a local in Austin, that desegregation was vital to this school district. It was vital to the children who were not receiving what they deserved.

And for whatever reason, court-ordered busing was the only thing that made this school district treat all children equitably.

This Association stands firm behind that commitment that all children be treated equitably; and if some court were to rule tomorrow that Austin could go back to the way it was, some of us would be here saying, "We can't do that. We can't go back to the way it was 10 years ago."

Seattle: *"Without a Court Order"*

. . .there are still idealists who believe that we can be a nation in which all people, regardless of color or creed can live together in harmony. We have this vision that our institutions will promote justice and equality. Certainly for those of us who have suffered past discriminatory acts, it is our hope that our children will not experience such emotional traumas.

. . .There are still some of us who wish to see a nation in which all citizens are treated fairly. Providing an educational opportunity in which children of different races can come together in a common experience is but one tool to help us achieve this. . .

ARLENE OKI, Seattle community leader, Japanese American Citizens League, and formerly first vice chair, Districtwide Committee on School Desegregation

On December 14, 1977, the elected seven-member Seattle school board voted 6-1 to approve a comprehensive citywide student assignment plan, "designed to desegregate the city's 112 schools over a two-year period." Entitled "the Seattle Plan for Elimination of Racial Imbalance by the 1979-80 School Year," the Seattle plan called for systemwide reassignment of white and minority students.

With the adoption of the Seattle Plan and its full implementation by the target date of 1979-80, Seattle set a national record, still unmatched: No other major American city has voluntarily adopted a comprehensive mandatory program of school desegregation.

Seattle's desegregation story may reflect both the general processes of problem-solving and decision-making in a democracy, and an emerging recognition of the racially pluralistic nature of this country. The adoption of the Seattle Plan was an attempt to create greater equality in a city. It is also the story of an elected body that took action which was possibly opposed by almost two-thirds of its constituents. This story could have implications for all school desegregation efforts in the United States.[24]

In part, the Seattle school board took this unprecedented action to avoid a threatened lawsuit and years of court stewardship.

The citizens of Seattle needed only look to the experiences of other cities—including the other two cities that are part of

this study—to learn quickly the wisdom of avoiding the costly conflict of protracted litigation.

The Seattle journey to school desegregation, however, was not entirely without court involvement, nor was it without conflict.

SCHOOL GOVERNANCE AND FUNDING

This multicultural city, justifiably described by its citizens as "the liveable city," contains aproximately 12 percent of the population of the State of Washington and educates 37 percent of the State's Black children. The boundaries of the city and the school district are coterminous; the school system, however, is governed independently of the city by a board of trustees,whose members are nominated by director districts in the primary election and voted on citywide in the final election.

Funds for public education in Washington are raised primarily by local property taxes allocated by the state legislature to local school districts. Until recently, local districts were dependent upon annual property tax levy elections for nearly one-third of their operating budget. A lawsuit brought by the Seattle school system resulted in a State Supreme Court decision in 1978, mandating full state funding for basic education. The Seattle challenge rested on the claim that by requiring local school districts to depend so heavily on the yearly passage of property tax levies, the State of Washington was violating its responsibility for the support of public education, as set forth in the State Constitution, which declares that it is:

A paramount duty of the State to make ample provision for the education of all children residing within its borders without distinction of, or preference on account of race, color, or sex.

The state apportionment addresses the needs of basic education. Local school districts may provide for enrichment of program (art, physical education, music, and the like) by passage of annual property tax levies, not to exceed 10 percent of their overall operating budgets. A grandfather clause, to be phased out by 1990, exempted from this 10 percent limitation approximately one-third of Washington's school districts, including Seattle, because their levy proceeds had traditionally exceeded the current basic state allocation by more than 10 percent.

Throughout the years, however, the school system's heavy dependence on the annual levy election has tended to increase the pressure upon successive Seattle school boards to move cautiously when considering controversial issues—desegregation, for example—that might affect the election's outcome.

EARLIER ENROLLMENT TRENDS

At the time the Seattle Plan was adopted, 65.3 percent of the 58,353 public school students in Seattle were White, 18.3 percent Black, 9.7 percent Asian American,* 2.9 percent Native American, and 3.8 percent Hispanic. The majority of the Black population lives in the central and southeastern areas of the city. In 1977, most of the schools in those areas were 70 percent to 96 percent minority.[25]

In 1954, however, Blacks comprised less than 4 percent of Seattle's population; thus, the announcement of the *Brown* decision initially had little impact here. School segregation was a matter of such general unconcern to Seattle school officials that no formal surveys were made of the racial distribution of students in the Seattle schools until 1957.[26] Occasional informal headcounts were made in schools whose enrollment included minority students. One such count of Garfield High School in central Seattle revealed that of the 2,133 students enrolled in 1940, four percent were Black, 84 percent white, and 12 percent Asian and other minorities.[27]

By the 1950s, however, patterns of segregation began to be perceptible—and perceived:

It wasn't . . . until my assignment as principal of Garfield High School in 1959 that I came to fully understand the dynamics . . . and the impact of . . . segregation on the students of the Seattle school district.

*Garfield, in 1959, according to the definition of a segregated school which the school board adopted in 1977**, was a segregated school, and the first segregated high school. And, of course, all of the feeder schools—the junior highs, the elementary schools—to Garfield were likewise segregated. . . . I served in that capacity for the 18 years at Garfield, and then at Franklin High School, which was to become the second high school to be a segregated high school. . . .*

During that time, I became convinced that the segregated schools were destructive in many ways to all of the students of the Seattle school district . . . and especially destructive to the minority students.

FRANK HANAWALT, former principal and desegregation planner, Seattle public schools

*The Asian population includes Chinese, 4.5 percent; Filipino, 3.7 percent; Japanese, 1.6 percent; Korean, 1.1 percent; Vietnamese, 2.3 percent; Southeast Asian, 3.4 percent; East Indian, .5 percent; Samoan, .9 percent; and all other Asian, .4 percent.

**Defined as a school in which a single minority enrollment exceeds 50 percent of the student body.

PRESSURES TO DESEGREGATE: VOLUNTARY PLANS

With intensifying civil rights activism during the '60s, the Seattle school system faced mounting pressure to do something about racial isolation in the schools. A lawsuit filed by the NAACP in 1962 called upon the district to end public school segregation. The suit was dropped the following year when the Seattle School Board, acting on the recommendation of its Citizens Advisory Committee for Equal Educational Opportunity, adopted a policy of voluntary racial transfers to improve racial balance. During 1963, 247 students—mostly Blacks—chose to transfer under this policy, even though they were required to furnish their own transportation. As has been invariably the case with "freedom-of-choice" plans—whether in the North or the South—the voluntary racial transfer policy placed almost the entire burden of desegregation on minority students. At its peak of operation, this program involved the transfer of 2600 students, all but 200 of them Black.

In 1964 the Seattle Urban League proposed to the school district a desegregation plan, which grouped schools into triads, each forming one large attendance area. One of the three schools would be predominantly minority, the other two predominantly white. The proposed grade configuration was that each school would have a kindergarten and two grades, up to the sixth grade; and the students from all three schools would progress through all three schools. The Triad Plan was rejected by the school board, but its system of desegregation would become an important part of the Seattle Plan.

Over the next 10 years, the desegregation conflict was a major part of public school life:

> *There have been boycotts and lawsuits, angry rhetoric and quiet frustration, the radical student politics and the flashpoint racial tensions of the late '60s and early '70s, moves toward centralization and decentralization, talk of integration and of preserving ethnic identity, court battles and an unsuccessful attempt to recall members of the School Board. . . .*[28]

A chronology prepared by the Seattle Municipal League outlines the milestones that marked Seattle's "road to desegregation."[29] Among the events recorded by the League were the following:

- **February 1966.** *Central area civil rights leaders plan a massive boycott to be held March 31 and April 1, protesting [the] "foot-dragging" and "do-nothing" attitude of Seattle school directors.*

- **March 1966.** *Lawsuit filed in U.S. District Court on behalf of 30 Black students. Suit seeks to end minority*

isolation in Central Area schools and development of comprehensive desegregation plan. Case is dismissed after Seattle School District agrees to take steps to alleviate racial segregation in the schools.

● **May 1966.** *One hundred "race relations seminars" are held in Central Area homes. Negro parents tell of their children experiencing racial discrimination in Seattle schools.*

● **June 1966.** *"Save our Neighborhoods" committee meets to discuss ways of preventing compulsory cross-town busing of children.*

● **July 1966.** *Citizens Committee for Voluntary School Transfers announces campaign to raise money for transportation costs of voluntary racial transfer students.*

● **February 1968.** *NAACP urges closure of Garfield High School and two other predominantly Black Central Area schools: Mann and Washington. Seattle Teachers Association proposes that students be bused in both directions to achieve racial balance in Central Area schools.*

● **July 1968.** *Garfield's music department is authorized to solicit $120,000 to establish a fine-arts magnet program aimed at attracting white students.*

● **September 1968.** *An 18-member School Conditions Committee, jointly sponsored by Seattle Council of PTAs and the Seattle Teachers Association, accuses the school district of failing to provide quality education. The committee's final report, issued in February 1969, concludes that most children in Seattle schools are being educationally short-changed in crowded, substandard and dangerous facilities.*

● **March 1969.** *A multi-racial slate is elected to the school board as the Central Area School Council is organized. There is increasing talk in Seattle and nationally of decentralizing control of big-city schools.* [The Central Area School Council was established to give parents in the inner city area a political base from which they could negotiate with the Seattle school system on educational concerns, including desegregation.]

● **August 1970.** *Lawsuit filed in federal court accuses the Seattle School Board of perpetuating racial segregation in schools by altering attendance boundaries, altering grade structures in some schools to increase the percentage of nonwhite students, operating a racially discriminatory student transfer program and excluding some students from the benefits of federally aided programs. Lawsuit asks that the school board be required to develop a plan allowing any student to attend any school in the district. Suit is voluntarily dismissed October 12, 1972, after the district institutes a middle school desegregation program.*

THE MIDDLE SCHOOL PROGRAM: POLITICAL DISASTER

We had a number of citizens groups who were angry at the school board for one thing and another—those who wanted to move fast on desegregation and those who wanted nothing to do with it. We had the signs "Save our schools," and the signs, "Save our neighborhood schools."

FORBES BOTTOMLY, former superintendent,
Seattle public schools

The middle school desegregation program, adopted in November 1970, was Seattle's first desegregation program that involved transportation of both white and minority students for desegregation purposes and the first to establish mandatory student assignments. Middle school desegregation was to have been the first phase of a program that would desegregate all grades of all schools in the city by 1973. The last two phases of the plan were aborted, however, and Phase One was delayed for a year by the immediacy and forcefulness of the opposition.

Anti-busing protests erupted; crosses were burned on the lawn of one board member; and in December 1970, a newly organized group, Citizens Against Mandatory Busing (CAMB) filed suit in King County Superior Court, seeking to block the middle school plan. In August 1971, the superior court judge signed an order delaying the plan for a year—an action reversed by the Washington State Supreme Court in April 1972.

In September 1972, the middle school desegregation program began; and for the first time the Seattle school system was using the school bus as a means of mandatory school desegregation.

The court defeat, however, was only the first round in CAMB's battle against busing. In February 1973, the group launched a petition drive to recall the four members of the board who had supported the middle school plan. The recall effort failed, however, the longer term effects of CAMB's battle were a temporary victory for anti-busing forces. The middle school plan did go into effect in September 1972; but Superintendent Bottomly resigned, and there were to be no further substantive desegregation efforts for five years.

SCHOOL LEVY LOSSES

School levies failed during this period, the first in 1973. A double levy loss during the 1975-76 school year brought the school system to a state of financial crisis, causing deep program cutbacks and layoffs of 2200 school employees. Reductions in force became an annual occurrence until 1983, severely curtailing school district affirmative action and faculty

desegregation efforts. Recruitment of minority teachers, the NEA Inquiry Panel was told, has been difficult even in the best of times; and in periods of staff retrenchment the problem of obtaining an appropriate staff racial balance is compounded. During the early 1970s, the school system tended to assign most of its minority staff members to predominantly minority schools. As a result, many buildings in the city had no minority teachers or only token representation on their staff.

In the spring of 1976, the school district agreed with the United States Office for Civil Rights (OCR) of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) to distribute minority teachers equitably throughout the district. This desegregation of staff was good for the system when the comprehensive desegregation plan was implemented in 1977. But, the immediate result was a one-day boycott by the Central Area School Council to protest the transfer to the North End and West Seattle schools of so many of the minority teachers, who were needed to maintain strong education programs and serve as role models in the predominantly minority schools. The school district complied with the OCR requirement to desegregate teaching staff—unquestionably an important part of desegregating schools. But the legitimate demand of minority schools to retain minority teachers presented a conflict that seems to exemplify the ambiguities of decision-making in this enormously complex task of school desegregation.

THE POWER OF A POSITIVE COMMUNITY

It seems a large number of people feel a sense of ownership in the Seattle Plan and the process that brought it into being. And that, of course, is one of the strengths of the Plan, that it is accepted by the community. The city was in a sense co-opted by the supporters of desegregation, leaving the opponents no significant leadership around which they could draw support.

DAN LEVANT, first chair,
Districtwide Advisory Committee

Organized community involvement was an integral part of the desegregation process in Seattle from its earliest voluntary beginnings.

The **Seattle Urban League**, the **NAACP**, and the **Central Area School Council** were the organizations whose pressure provided the initial impetus to desegregation; all three remained actively involved as the Seattle Plan was adopted and implemented.

The **Coalition for Quality Integrated Education (CQIE)**, incorporated in 1971, brought together three *ad hoc* groups, which had formed to support middle school desegregation

efforts. The CQIE, supported by Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) and Title VII funds, federal funds made available to minimize or remedy discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. The Coalition arranged a number of activities to make the middle school desegregation program successful: shared activities among parents from the different schools; student exchange programs between predominantly Black and predominantly white schools; a volunteer instruction program bringing into the schools specialists in a great variety of subjects; arranging release time for minority employees of Seattle area companies to come into the schools as volunteers to work with students; and an integrated summer program offering foreign language, math, and arts instruction.

The **Seattle Teachers Association** was one of the city's earliest, most active and effective advocates of mandatory desegregation, two-way busing of students, affirmative action, and equity in the entire process of desegregation. Through position statements; cooperation with various community groups; and through collective bargaining, when bargaining was permitted by state law, the Association participated actively in supporting desegregation efforts and working to ensure the equity of those efforts.

The **Seattle Council PTSA**, which opposed busing for desegregation purposes in 1970, reversed its position and in January 1977, adopted a motion stating:

. . .whereas, Seattle has the longest history of voluntary efforts to desegregate the schools and whereas, these voluntary efforts have placed a major burden of desegregation on black students and resulted in increased segregation in Seattle schools; therefore, be it resolved that the Seattle Council PTSA urges the Seattle school district to develop in addition to voluntary efforts mandatory strategies for desegregation.

Before the Seattle Plan was adopted and after it was implemented, the Seattle Council PTSA played an active role in cooperation with the Seattle Teachers Association and the school administration. The Council conducted human relations workshops, encouraged interaction among parents and students in desegregating schools, arranged volunteer programs, including volunteer bus stop monitors, brought the parents into the schools and helped to build closer relationships between the schools and their communities.

The **American Friends Service Committee (AFSC)** worked with a multiracial group of students from a geographic cross-section of the city involving them in discussions about desegregation and preparing them to develop a student hot line to respond to concerns of other students. As the discussions evolved, the group began to center its attention on questions of student rights—discipline and due process and

suspensions. The students obtained data from the school system on these subjects; the information confirmed their own experiences and replicated the experience of other cities—that minority students, particularly Black students, were suspended at much higher rates than other students. The initial discussions led to a long range study, discussion, and action project in which the school district has begun to participate, analyzing its own treatment of minority students and listening to suggestions for alternative disciplinary methods.

The **American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU)** of Washington appointed a task force on school desegregation in 1976 to inquire into the problems of segregation in Seattle public schools. As a result of the findings of that group, the ACLU Legal Committee, working together with the Urban League, the Church Council of Greater Seattle, the AFSC, and the American Jewish Committee, prepared to file a lawsuit—or to threaten one—to influence the school system to adopt a mandatory desegregation program. This action by ACLU, together with the threat of a similar court action by the NAACP, did in fact have major impact, all witnesses seem to agree, in the 1977 decision of the Seattle school board to adopt the Seattle Plan.

The **Church Council of Greater Seattle**, through its Task Force on Racial Justice, adopted a position statement declaring support for mandatory strategies of school desegregation and stating that "schools which are presently identified with minority communities must maintain sufficient numbers of minority students in order that their racial identity can be maintained." The statement was reviewed and approved by various other organizations, the Black United Clergy for Action, and the Asian Churches. Ann Siqueland, working for the Church Council, conducted forums in churches throughout Seattle, educating and organizing support for desegregation. In June 1977, the Church Council voted to join with the ACLU and NAACP in the filing of a desegregation lawsuit against the school system.

The **People Power Coalition** was organized in 1971 as an avenue for the media to participate in discussion of current community issues. In 1976, the Coalition turned to the most pressing issue of the day, school desegregation, and sought funding to conduct forums on that subject. According to Ann Siqueland, "The media covered the forums well, and the forums were one of the factors which focused [on] the issues surrounding litigation and helped several individuals to make the decision that they would eliminate segregation by their own action, rather than allow a court to decide the issue."[30]

DISTRICTWIDE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

These organizations, and more than 50 others, were represented in the **Districtwide Advisory Committee (DWAC)**, a citizens group formed in the fall of 1974 to advise Superintendent Loren Troxell on desegregation matters. Perhaps no one, including the members of DWAC themselves, anticipated the depth of involvement and influence these groups would have in the shaping and implementation of the plan that would eventually desegregate Seattle's public schools. The chair of DWAC discussed with the NEA panel the phenomenon of the group's emergence as a power in the desegregation movement:

We were a runaway committee that did whatever we pleased, achieving enough public attention through the media to protect us against any attempts to cut us off. In the meantime, the process of coalition building was going on. The Church Council and the AFSC gave us morality, the Urban League got through the response constantly to the charge that they, even the Blacks, don't want it. The League of Women Voters gave us respectability, the Japanese-American Citizens League and the Asian American Educators Association brought racial diversity. When the PTSA, through some heroic leadership, came in, we then had authority.

There would be changes in the leadership of DWAC; but the coalition would remain together and would remain a central force in persuading the superintendent and school board to abandon failed voluntary methods of desegregation.

A NEW SUPERINTENDENT SEEKS ASSISTANCE

In August 1976, the Seattle school board hired a new superintendent, David Moberly, who was not known as an advocate of mandatory desegregation. However, Dr. Moberly was known to be an administrator with a strong business sense; and the school district, having just suffered a series of levy defeats, sought someone who "spoke 'budget' fluently and without accent."[31] The new superintendent, though he might not be committed to school desegregation, was committed to ensuring that whatever action he took in this controversial area would have the backing of Seattle's civic leaders.

As part of his orientation to Seattle, Dr. Moberly had called on various community leaders in an effort to assess the city's political climate. He placed special emphasis on discovering their opinions regarding desegregation. The Municipal League of Seattle and King County (perhaps the area's most highly regarded nonpartisan civic group) and the Seattle Chamber of Commerce were specifically asked to form task forces within their organizations to study the issue. By early 1977, the Chamber's Desegregation Task Force had been

established and the Municipal League's Education Committee . . . had also begun to study the subject of desegregation.[32]

With the support of these two organizations, Superintendent Moberly, in January 1977, announced a "magnet school" program, to start in the fall of that year. His announced goal was 1,000 new voluntary racial transfers, 700 of them white, in addition to the 2,200 students, mostly Black, already in the transfer program. This decision was regarded with skepticism by some supporters of school desegregation, and with outrage by others.

One of the outraged was the Chair of DWAC, Dan Levant, who resigned publicly in protest.

A public resignation is a very powerful political statement. . . . I was outraged by the brutality of the superintendent imposing the Magnet Plan in defiance of everybody else who was working on desegregation.

I thought I had about 48 hours to take the best shot I could so that by the time the plan got to the Board and went public, it would be on the defensive. . . . I sometimes think the major contribution that I made to the whole process was wounding the Magnet Plan at the beginning.

The original plans were for white programs and black programs, academic programs and vocational programs. It was racist. But the real danger of the Magnet Program was that it would tie up the district for the next three to five years. It would be another five years before we could get back to the point of saying, "Well, this hasn't worked. What do we do now?"[33]

Dan Levant's replacement, Dr. Richard Andrews shifted the approach of DWAC from one of confrontation to one of negotiation and compromise.

A major part of the work of DWAC, under Andrews's chairmanship, was the development of criteria for a desegregation program. The members of the advisory group were not in complete accord regarding the content of such a plan. There were members who remained skeptical of mandatory student assignments and favored other desegregation methods, including magnet plans as proposed by the superintendent. Others, seeing that voluntary plans, including magnet plans, had succeeded nowhere in eliminating segregation, were adament in their advocacy of a mandatory plan. The central issue was this: Could the creation of a distinctive educational program at a few schools, open to enrollment by voluntary choice, effectively desegregate an entire school system? The experience of Seattle indicated otherwise, as emphasized by the Seattle school board general counsel in his testimony to the panel:

Seattle tried for 15 years every conceivable method to desegregate voluntarily, but the demographic forces at work when you have a segregated neighborhood school system,

which causes more segregated neighborhoods, which causes more segregated schools—and it's a segregative snowball—completely overwhelmed any kind of voluntary transfer activities that could be done even in a time when the federal government was putting millions of dollars behind that in the late '70s.

. . .[I]n a large district, with a substantial number of minority students,. . .every experience we have had teaches us that there is absolutely no way to desegregate . . . without extensive reliance on mandatory busing . . . until we do a better job of encouraging residential integration. And it really appalls me to hear suggestions to the contrary coming from people who ought to know better.

The desegregation plan criteria developed by DWAC were essentially those that were adopted by the Seattle school board in May 1977. The Board-adopted criteria provided that its desegregation plan should:

- place no greater burden on minority than majority students
- provide for desegregation within schools as well as between schools
- preserve and enhance schools already integrated
- include grades K-12
- create and maintain stability and predictability to the extent possible, creating consistent feeder patterns and continuity of programs.[34]

The magnet program, to be considered by the board in March 1977, was analyzed by members of DWAC to determine if it would meet the requirements of the new criteria. The analysis, completed in February, 1977, indicated that it would not meet those criteria. During this same period, some DWAC members visited school systems in other states to observe magnet programs in action:

The results of the analysis of the computer data and the firsthand observations of magnet schools by DWAC members produced the same conclusions. Magnets would not work on an elementary level because they created in-building segregation. On a high school level, where substantial funding was available, magnets were educationally successful and exciting but produced few student transfers. There was no way to guarantee desegregation with magnet programs because a mandatory backup to a special program was not practical.[35]

DWAC's analysis was presented to the board. On March 7, without questions or comments on the analysis, the school board voted to adopt the Magnet Program. Soon thereafter, the groups within DWAC that had spoken of court action began to speak of it again.

The Magnet Program adopted by the board in March

1977 was introduced in 27 Seattle schools in September 1977. The impact of that program on racial isolation in the schools was reported in a *History of School Desegregation in Seattle Public Schools, 1954-1981*, by former desegregation planners in the school system, Robert Williams and Frank Hanawalt:

A number of schools with Magnet Programs improved racial distribution from that of the previous fall. In terms of impact on racial imbalance as defined in Board Resolution 1977-#8, however, the schools which were racially imbalanced in 1976-77 remained racially imbalanced in 1977-78, with one additional school, Rainier View, being added to the list. While it appeared evident that the addition of magnet programs would not in itself desegregate the Seattle schools, there was supportive evidence that voluntary strategies, magnet and nonmagnet, could be significant components of a more comprehensive desegregation plan.

The then Mayor of Seattle, Wesley Uhlman, had remained in touch with school desegregation developments and was aware of the threatened lawsuit. The Deputy Mayor at that time, R.W. Wilkinson, meeting with the NEA panel, recalled Mayor Uhlman's deliberations about becoming actively involved in the school desegregation controversy. He, like every city and school leader who has been awake over the past 10 years, was also aware of the violence and civil disruption that had occurred following the 1975 court-ordered busing in Boston. He was hesitant to intervene in the school system's controversy; but he was also determined to avoid, if possible, another Boston in the Northwest. Before taking action, however, he investigated. Wilkinson, told the panel about that investigation:

We did . . . conduct a somewhat confidential survey in which my staff called and interviewed 30 mayors . . . in the cities around the country, where desegregation had taken place—where it had worked and where it had not gone into effect with any degree of ease.

What the mayors told us, what the people in the communities told us was, the degree to which it worked depended . . . on the degree to which the city governments and the business community shared in the leadership of reaching a solution. To the extent that they said, this isn't really our problem and turned away, the problem blew up and was that much worse. Our conclusion . . . was that the city government had to take a position. . . .

Having made the decision, Mayor Uhlman and his staff worked with the Municipal League, the Urban League, and the Chamber of Commerce to enlist their support.

Together, the mayor, and the presidents of these three prestigious organizations addressed a letter to the school board president, dated May 20, 1977. The letter placed the three organizations and the City of Seattle—

. . .on record together and as one voice to declare united support for your adoption of a definition of racial isolation and measurable goals leading to the elimination of racial isolation in the Seattle public schools, prior to a court-ordered and mandated desegregation remedy.

On May 25, 1977, the school board voted 4-2 (one member abstaining) to end racial imbalance in Seattle schools by the start of the 1979-80 school year, and agreed to adopt a definition of racial imbalance by June 8, 1977. Racial imbalance was defined by the board as:

. . .the situation that exists when the combined minority student enrollment in a school exceeds the districtwide combined minority average by 20 percentage points, provided that the single minority enrollment (as defined by current federal categories) of no school will exceed 50 percent of the student body.

"NO NAME COMMITTEE"

Over the next several months, the coalition supporting desegregation was divided by its own philosophical and practical differences: One faction wanted mandatory measures to be adopted as a back-up to voluntary desegregation strategies; the other wanted a comprehensive system of mandatory student assignment, with voluntary options (including the option of magnet programs), providing these options contributed to desegregation. When it appeared that the groups would reach impasse, the suggestion was made by the president of the Municipal League that a small, informal discussion group of representatives from the various DWAC organizations meet weekly to thrash out the issues that divided them. The group, which became known as the "No Name Committee," did meet, with the result that hostilities were lessened. All groups agreed upon desegregation as a goal, although differences remained as to the strategies of achieving it.

DECEMBER 14, 1977

The final desegregation proposal, as adopted by the Seattle school board on December 14, 1977, was a joint product of Seattle School System Desegregation Planner Richard Dyksterhuis and DWAC Chair Richard Andrews. It was a plan of fixed-assignment-first with options. The present superintendent of Seattle public schools, stated to the NEA panel:

The Seattle Plan relies on roughly equal numbers of mandatory and voluntary student reassignments to accomplish desegregation of the schools. Where voluntary strategies alone appear incapable of achieving desegregation, elementary schools are desegregated by joining the populations of two or three neighborhoods in "pairs" or "triads" . . . students

from both neighborhoods in a pair attend school together, first in grades 1-3 at one site, then in grades 4-6 at the other site. Thus, students are assigned initially on the basis of their neighborhood and not individually on the basis of race. Students brought together in the elementary grades follow the same "feeder patterns" to the secondary schools. Neighborhood students stay together throughout their school careers if they so choose, and students have predictability in their assignments. . . . Equity of movement was a key feature of the plan as developed—roughly equal numbers of minority and majority students were initially mandatorily assigned. Over the past few years, there has been some slippage away from the key concept.

At the December 14 meeting, Deputy Mayor Wilkinson apeared before the board to present a joint statement of support of the Mandatory Assignment Plan on behalf of the outgoing Mayor Uhlman and incoming Mayor Charles Royer. Their endorsement completed the solid basis of support from civic and community leaders.

Mayor Royer told the NEA panel some of the actions the city took to assist in harmonious implementation of the Seattle Plan:

A crisis desegregation intervention plan for peaceful school desegregation was developed by the City to help in the implementation of the Plan. It was put together by our Human Rights Department, the City Attorney's Office, and the Mayor's Office in cooperation with the Community Relations Division of the U.S. Justice Department and the Seattle school district.

Our plan was developed so as to be able to provide some positive assurances and some specific plans for the process of desegregation, including access to educational programs, public safety, security around transportation . . . and productive educational environments for our school children.

Back in the old days when we had CETA [federal funds under the Comprehensive Education and Training Act], *the city committed a significant number of positions to the school district to help provide bus monitors, crossing guards and personnel for the Information and Referral Center, which was staffed to aid in the implementation of the Plan.*

Before the start of the 1978 school year, my office briefed the editorial boards of our two daily newspapers and the four television stations suggesting ways that the media could help to reduce the tensions around the opening of school and making certain that they . . . knew of our plans, knew of our involvement, knew of our concerns for security and the like. We also coordinated with the school district our day-care services, our parks and recreational programs so as to be able to meet the changing needs of kids who are changing schools.

Mayor Royer also spoke of some of the fringe benefits of school desegregation:

. . .as a result of having moved through the desegregation effort I believe we created a climate where other positive things have happened. We wrote into law probably the most thorough affirmative action ordinance law in the country for a city. . . .

I believe we have one of the most comprehensive women and minority business enterprise ordinances in the country, again through city participation . . . .

We undertook in 1979 a scattered site housing program in Seattle . . . we have created more than 650 new subsidized houses scattered throughout the city to provide family housing opportunity. . . .

. . .we supported and put considerable dollars into a single-family rehabilitation program to allow people to stay in their homes, in their neighborhoods, and to ward off what the planners call gentrification, which is generally white, upper income assumption of neighborhoods. . . .

DESEGREGATION REVIEW ADVISORY COMMITTEE

In September 1982, the Seattle school board initiated the first comprehensive review of the Seattle Plan since it had been implemented in the fall of 1978. The stated purposes of the review were to evaluate the success of the Plan, identify deficiencies, and make recommendations for improvement. The report of the District Review Advisory Committee (DRAC) was presented to the board on November 16, 1983. The chairman of that committee, Larry Ransom, told the NEA panel that the major problems the committee found had to do with resegregation. Classes for academically gifted students were found to be predominantly majority; regular and lower level classes were found to be predominantly minority. Further, the committee found that the various options and magnet programs were undermining the mandatory plan:

There were concerns that there was a conflict created between the mandatory portion of the program and the voluntary components . . . such that the district was effectively sabotaging its mandatory assignments with its voluntary assignments. There was concern that if a plan was going to be premised on mandatory assignments, that the students receiving those . . . assignments should be receiving an education which is as good or better than anything else the district has to offer. . . .

The Seattle superintendent has made recommendations based on the DRAC Committee report; and the board has adopted those recommendations.

Among the major features of the revised plan, in addition to various adjustments to individual assignments to remedy

the slippage to which Superintendent Nelson referred, are the following:

- To modify the definition of racial imbalance so as to reflect more accurately the current racial and ethnic composition of the student population. (Racial balance exists in a school system when the racial composition of the enrollment in individual schools and the district as a whole is similar. Racial imbalance exists when the racial composition of school and district is far apart. Most desegregation plans permit the existence of a disparity within a certain range. If, for example, the permitted range of a half-Black or half-white school system is 15 points plus or minus—the ratio now being used in Seattle—a school system could be either 35 or 65 percent Black or white before being regarded as racially imbalanced.)
- To increase the number of all-day kindergarten programs to be offered in the fall of 1984.
- To develop the means to deliver a gifted/enrichment component in each pair/triad school beginning in 1985-86, with four schools serving as pilot sites in 1984-85.
- To place new option programs in all pair/triad and tipping schools, in order to enhance the educational offering in these schools and better enable them to compete with optional programs outside the pair/triad configuration.

The cost of the program revisions is estimated at $2.1 million. Approximately 11,000 students will receive immediate benefits from the newly funded option and kindergarten programs.

INITIATIVE 350: "MAJORITIES ARE NOT ALWAYS RIGHT."

I am representative of a whole lot of folks out there who don't necessarily look like me, but I think kind of act like me and think like me.

ROBERT DORSE, president,
Citizens for Voluntary Integration Committee (CIVIC)

A final effort to stop busing, and obstruct desegregation in Seattle was launched in 1978, when a group calling itself Citizens for Voluntary Integration Committee (CIVIC) placed on the November ballot a statewide initiative (Initiative 350), which was drafted to terminate the use of mandatory assignments for purposes of racial integration in the public schools of the State of Washington. The voters passed the measure by a 2-1 margin in the statewide election. In Seattle the voters favored the initiative in all areas, except two legislative districts, Central and near Northeast Seattle, in which minorities comprise the population majority.

With passage, the measure became state law; and imme-

diately, the Seattle school board authorized its attorneys to challenge its constitutionality in court. The Seattle Plan was allowed to proceed as scheduled, when a U.S. district court judge granted a temporary restraining order, blocking Initiative 350 from taking effect pending the outcome of the litigation.

The Seattle school district won the case at every level; and defendants appealed all the way to the United States Supreme Court. At the outset of the litigation, the United States, along with various civil rights organizations, had intervened on the side of the school district. But, by the time the matter reached the U.S. Supreme Court, there was a new national Administration and an entirely new attitude about the rights and wrongs of equal justice. At the Supreme Court level, the United States switched sides and took the position that the Initiative was constitutional.

The Supreme Court upheld the decision of lower courts, criticizing Initiative 350 because it had allowed busing of students for all purposes except desegregation. Thus, its provisions created an impermissible racial classification in violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

The mindset—the emotionally straitjacketed attitude—that motivated Initiative 350 still exists. But as one of Seattle's Black leaders affirmed, the information and the understandings necessary to overcome that mindset can be found—if they are to be found anywhere—in enlightened public education:

We still have those who took us to court. . .We still have those attitudes, but that's life, and we're going to have to strengthen our young people with positive attitudes about themselves and their ability to achieve . . . in order that they can overcome those attitudes. . . .

We have a system which continues racism. It is institutionalized, and we aren't going to get over that very easily. I wish there were some magic answer, but there isn't. . . . We are going to have to constantly monitor and see what's happening, and make adjustments and strengthen the decision-makers and make them responsible for equal decisions, fairness, and opportunities for all.

DOROTHY HOLLINGSWORTH, former board member,
Seattle public schools

3

Patterns of Achievement

The choice before the nation is not whether its urban schools should be desegregated—that issue has been settled by the findings of unconstitutional segregation in most cities, judicial recognition of the right to desegregation, and insistence by civil rights groups on enforcing this right. The choice is whether we will integrate in a peaceful, beneficial, and lasting way. Although there can be many disagreements about particular strategies, it should not be difficult to make the choice once the issue is honestly faced.[1]

For the school systems included in this study, the road to desegregation was long, arduous, sometimes hazardous, but ultimately rewarding. It took years, it took the prodding of civil rights groups, and it took court orders, or threats of court orders, to move the white leaders of these communities finally to face up to the constitutional imperative of school desegregation. But once that inescapable reality was confronted, school officials and staff, civic and community leaders, and the front line people—the teachers, principals, students, and parents—moved with determination, competence, and, in generally good faith, to get the job done. Their reward was the discovery that the educational and community outcomes of desegregation were worth the struggle.

CHOICES

The NEA Inquiry Panel asked many of the people who testified in Charlotte-Mecklenburg, Austin, and Seattle, if, considering the hardships and the sacrifices they had been required to make to achieve desegregation, would they, if

"Yes, desegregation was worth it, although Blacks . . . have borne the brunt of it. We were in the minority. If whites had been the minority, they would have borne the brunt of it. . . . It has made it possible for other good things to happen in this community. Blacks serve on boards and committees and commissions in city and county government. The schools have brought people together in a way that no other institution in the society could have done."

ELIZABETH RANDOLPH, former administrator, Charlotte-Mecklenburg public schools

given a choice, choose to go back to the racially segregated way it was. No one—not even those most concerned about the still imperfect way it is—said they would make that choice. In these, as in other desegregated school systems, it has been the minority student who has borne the greatest burden of desegregation, but Black students and parents—some with hesitation—declared the trade-off to be worth the sacrifice.

The major gains cited had to do with equity: improvement of facilities and educational materials, and wider educational opportunities. For example, in Charlotte, O.N. Freeman, a Black former principal and central office administrator, now retired, was asked if he thought Black students in the community would be better off in a segregated system, considering the losses they had experienced in the closure of Black schools. His answer was, "No," and he listed some of the things that had been lacking or inadequate in the Black schools:

. . .no pencils, no shades, no projectors, no filmstrip machines, not enough crayons, desks were not appropriate for children's sizes, overcrowded classrooms . . . you name it. The basic tools for learning. Black teachers and principals had to get out and have barbecues, fish fries . . . and were not even exposed to what a standardized classroom was like in terms of class size, class climate, and conditions and materials to work with.

Similar reports of racially segregated inequality were heard in both Austin and Seattle:

[After] desegregation here in Austin—what we saw immediately was the improvement of facilities and plant. It was virtually overnight . . . Johnston High School—the vocational type, Mexican American minority type high school—got millions of dollars worth of improvements. . . .

. . .the [Anglo] parents were encouraged to go and see the school, meet the faculty, meet the staff . . . They actually saw what the Black and Mexican American communities were going to school in, saw the books, saw the situation . . . Most times now, when I get a phone call about an East Austin school or a Northeast Austin school I get it from an Anglo parent who lives across town saying, "This facility needs this; this facility needs that."

ABEL RUIZ, school board member, Austin Independent School District

The Urban League . . . tried to rid us of a segregated school system . . . We in our community did not care whether we sat next to a white student. We came to school to learn. Education was our foremost consideration, not who you sit next to.

Our schools and our communities were dilapidated . . . and our textbooks. And not only that, but we got ineffective

teachers as well, because all you had to do was babysit our children. You didn't have to teach them anything. You could teach them the same program you'd been teaching them for 10 years, and it didn't make any difference whether the kids learned anything or not.

TYRA ELLIOT, secretary to the board of directors, Seattle Urban League

BENEFITS OF DESEGREGATION

Aside from the issue of equity, most students, most teachers, most principals, and most parents in all three communities, when asked about the advantage of desegregation, spoke of the need for public schools to prepare students to deal with the kinds of class, race, and individual diversity they would encounter in the world after school. The segregated world had offered more security and support for both Blacks and whites, but it could not offer this essential part of preparation for life.

"I do not believe, if the school plan was not a workable, working, successful plan, that we would have elected a Harvey Gantt as Mayor of Charlotte."

SIS KAPLAN, former chair, Charlotte Community Relations Commission

Other benefits of desegregation cited in all three cities included:

Increased public support for community needs. In Charlotte and Austin, school bond issues, and in Seattle, a school operating levy, have been passed by unusually large margins. In Charlotte, the passage of an airport bond issue was attributed to the large vote it got from Black citizens, whose members have come to believe they have a greater stake in the general welfare of the community. In all three cities, testimony indicated, since the schools have been desegregated, citizens have shown a heightened sense of community involvement and activism, which has been good for business and good for civic progress. In Charlotte, a Black mayor has been elected. In Seattle, various progressive measures have been enacted to improve the quality of life and equality of opportunity for all citizens.

". . .as a result of having moved through the desegregation effort I believe we created a climate where other positive things have happened."

MAYOR CHARLES ROYER, Seattle

Increased parental involvement in the public schools. During the years of desegregation controversy, public education became a major public concern. The school systems that had always sought parental involvement got perhaps more of it than they were prepared to handle; and in those early days, much of that involvement was disruptive and hostile to desegregation efforts. Though the conflict over desegregation has largely been resolved, parents of all racial and ethnic groups remain more actively concerned with school affairs than they were, in the segregated schools of the past. For the first time, politically influential white parents have an interest in schools in predominantly minority neighborhoods because their children have been assigned there. The result is that educational inequities are being eliminated. A major fringe benefit of this heightened parental participation in public

"Parent-citizen involvement in the schools . . . had been something that had not been occurring very actively until after the Brown *decision and everybody suddenly decided the schools belonged to them again."*

JANE WELLS, community leader, Austin

"The planning commission, the city council, the county commissioners, and others are more responsive than they were earlier to the school board and the pupil assignment plan. . . . There is a high level of sensitivity among those planning and making the decisions today not to do something that would adversely affect the plan. When we speak up now on those issues, we are being heard."

JAY ROBINSON, superintendent, Charlotte-Mecklenburg public schools

"On the basis of standardized tests, we have had substantial improvement for all our children. The minority children have gained slightly more than the Anglo children. There is still a disparity between the two, but clearly the minority children are developing rapidly and doing extremely well."

JOHN ELLIS, superintendent, Austin Independent School District

"We have increased the ethnic literacy of our students and our staff. That is something that is not measured by standardized tests. I think our students feel a lot more comfortable crossing ethnic lines. I don't think they feel as threatened by talking and associating and developing relationships with other ethnic groups."

T.J. VASSAR, school board member, Seattle public schools

education is that parents of different neighborhoods, cultures, and racial and ethnic groups, in working with each other over shared school concerns, are beginning to learn what the school desegregation experience has to teach their children—the beauty of differences and the differences of beauty.

Progress in the desegregation of housing. With the implementation of systemwide desegregation programs, witnesses said white parents have been less inclined to flee from one neighborhood to another to escape having their children become isolated white minorities in schools that have grown predominantly Black. Under a comprehensive plan, theoretically, no schools should become predominantly Black. In reality, however, school systems do not always monitor and update their student assignment program to compensate for racially changing neighborhoods; so that some resegregation has occurred in each of these school systems.

Improved test scores for all students. The achievement test scores of all students have improved; in Charlotte and Austin the improvement has been particularly notable, and improvement of scores for minorities has significantly narrowed the gap between minorities and whites.

Improvement of education for all children. In the desegregated schools and classrooms of Charlotte-Mecklenburg, Austin, and Seattle, students are learning to get along with, and to respect others who are different from themselves. Not only are they learning from each other, but the curricula of their schools, though not fully integrated, have begun to reflect the multicultural nature of our history and current reality. White students, released from the provincial insularity of all-white schools, are learning that the customs and values of their culture are not the sole customs and values of a pluralistic society. Minority students, for the first time, are gaining access to educational opportunities previously reserved for the majority group. Inequities still exist; and the effects of past inequities cannot be remedied overnight. Nevertheless, minority students are learning that they can compete in the wider world and they can win honors in that world.

Heightened sense of civic pride. In all three communities, testimony indicated, a strong sense of civic pride had contributed, finally, to the successful desegregation of the schools. Though members of the business and civic establishment in each city had initially resisted comprehensive student reassignment, once the message was conveyed that the constitutional mandate could not be evaded, these leaders, along with many other white citizens, were determined that if the job must be done, it would be done as peacefully as possible, and with their support. Having cooperated in the accomplishment of this difficult task, white leaders at each location expressed pride in the fact that their city had overcome its resistance

and had complied with the law, to the general betterment of the community.

Desegregation has been accomplished and has opened up a wider world for all the students in these three school districts. This is but the first step toward the challenge of integration, where success is not easy to measure and even less easily achieved. But without this crucial first step, the educational and human problems that stand in they way of integration would not be confronted and could never be resolved.

WHAT MADE DESEGREGATION WORK?

It seems a large number of people feel a sense of ownership in the Seattle Plan and the process that brought it into being. And that, of course, is one of the strengths of the Plan, that is is accepted by the community. The city was in a sense co-opted by the supporters of desegregation, leaving the opponents no significant leadership around which they could draw public support.

DAN LEVANT, chair,
Desegregation Review Advisory Committee, Seattle

. . .at that particular moment in history when the eyes of the nation were turned toward Charlotte, this community tried on some new ideas and rose to the test because of its working professionals, educators, journalists, and school board members, whose dedication to public education . . . convinced parents involved that this school system could work desegregated and would work desegregated. They promised this community that desegregated education would launch us on a journey toward quality education for all. I . . . believe they are keeping their promise.

JEANNE BOHN, director of community affairs,
WSOC-TV, Charlotte, North Carolina

. . .if the board and the administration can recruit the backing of the leadership of the community, if the board is working for it and the administration is working for it, and your newspaper editorials are helping you . . . then you have a good chance.

DECOURCEY KELLY, former board member,
Austin Independent School District

The NEA Inquiry Panel addressed one particular question to most of the witnesses with whom it met in Charlotte, Austin, and Seattle: What, and who contributed most significantly to the achievement of desegregation in the school district? Their answers revealed, in these three diverse communities, a strikingly similar configuration of circumstances

and leaders whereby the school systems designed and implemented their comprehensive desegregation plans.

The principal actors—and moving factors—in the desegregation of these school communities were identified as follows:

Forceful and effective leadership from the superintendent. Austin's superintendent, John Ellis, came to the Austin Independent School District in May 1980 and directed the court-ordered desegregation program from its beginnings. Jay Robinson was appointed to the Charlotte-Mecklenburg superintendency in 1977, two years after the court withdrew. Both men were given high marks by those who testified for their strong professional commitment to the development of programs of quality integrated education.

David Moberly, the Seattle superintendent at the time the Seattle Plan was adopted, was known also as a strong administrator. His particular skill in moving the adoption and implementation of the Seattle Plan, the NEA panel was told, lay in his ability to make allies of the city's business and civic leaders—the white power structure. At the same time, he worked effectively with the progressive community activists who were, in a sense, surrounding the system with their carefully organized and determined campaign to put into place a fair and effective desegregation program.

Moberly was succeeded by Donald Steele, under whose leadership the Desegregation Review Advisory Committee conducted a comprehensive evaluation of the Seattle Plan. Robert Nelson, the present superintendent, was formerly deputy superintendent and, through years of administrative leadership in the system, has earned the respect and trust of citizens and staff.

The characteristics of leadership that are effective in desegregating a school system are much the same qualities that are effective in leading a school system: a reputation for integrity, fair and firm program direction, ability to relate openly to staff members and to the public, skill in involving the active participation of staff, including the professional organizations, and in enlisting the participation of various segments of the community—the civic elite and community leaders, the civil rights community, parent groups, and the media.

Careful preparation for desegregation. Very little was left to chance as the three school systems moved finally toward the implementation of the desegregation plans. In each location, the plans themselves were carefully formulated, with strong regard for fairness and stability. In each school system, the community was involved—either through consultation, as in Austin, or through actual collaboration in the writing, as in Charlotte and Seattle—in the shaping of the desegregation plan.

Extensive human relations training was carried out for

both administrators and staff at the outset, and in the earliest stages of implementation, of the desegregation plans. Teachers were involved in staff development programs, at times in retreat settings. In Seattle, some of the leadership and financial support for these kinds of programs came from the State Department of Public Instruction, which played a supportive role throughout the desegregation process. In all three systems, major financing for staff development and other desegregation related programs was provided by the federal government under the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA). As ESAA funds have been eliminated under the current Administration, staff development programs also have been either eliminated or severely curtailed.

In all three school systems, careful attention was given to ensuring the welfare and safety of children as they were transported to their new school assignments. Human relations training was provided the bus drivers; monitors were employed on the buses that would transport the smaller children; community volunteers were engaged for bus stop duty to ensure that the children were at the right place at the right time for their buses.

Rumor control centers were set up to ensure that the concerns and complaints of parents were answered. Communications centers operated from the central administrative offices to ensure responses to emergency situations at schools throughout the districts. Crisis intervention teams were kept in a state of readiness, to be dispatched to any school where disruptions were occurring, or were imminent.

In each of the study locations, NEA panel members talked with central office staff members who had been on duty during the time that the plans were implemented. As they discussed the long hours of high tension responsibility during those days and the infinitely careful attention to minute detail that was necesary to make sure that nothing that could be humanly prevented would go wrong—the dedication of these skilled and caring professional people was clearly evident.

Strong leadership within individual schools. The success of desegregation, like the quality of education, is to a large extent a product of the effective collaboration of four groups of people: principals, teachers, students, and parents. At each location, the NEA panel heard of the constructive work done by school principals to ensure the success of collaborative effort. The testimony of one of these principals—Adan Salgado of Johnston High School in Austin—offers an example of the concerned and skilled care that these principals gave to the effective implementation of desegregation programs. In 1979, the year before desegregation, Johnston High School had an enrollment of 1200 students, 99.5 percent minority. The proposed plan called for the busing in of approximately 1,000 students.

"I know that integrated education is workable, because I was a high school principal in a school that had about every group that is present in the city of Seattle. Each was treated with enormous respect, but it took 14 and 16 hour days."

ROBERTA BARR, former principal, Seattle public schools

As the plan began to develop, we at Johnston High School began to mobilize, appointing committees to take care of different aspects of the . . . plan . . . We had five basic committees, dealing with students, with parents, with teachers, with the curriculum, and with the existing building itself and the needs that had to be met.

After all our plans were laid out . . . in the spring of 1980 we began to receive parents and students who were coming to visit, to look at Johnston High School, because Johnston High School is located—is not on the way to anywhere. If you want to go to Johnston High School, that's where you go.

So the parents who lived in Northwest Austin and in South Austin . . . came to visit us, look us over, and see what we looked like. What they found—I think . . . they found a faculty and a staff that was willing to provide the best possible education for their children, to work with the parents, to work with the students, to work with anyone that was involved with the education of a child and to provide the best possible education that we could provide.

I would be less than candid if I sat here and told you that there were no problems. There were problems indeed.

But the thing that I think pleased most parents—and this is the point I want to drive home—we involved parents from the very beginning in every aspect we could involve them in, and we involved the students in most of the activities at the school.

One of the spin-offs of this was that one of our newly developed parent teacher associations was selected the outstanding parent teacher association out of a 16-county area in Texas.

I firmly believed that if we were going to succeed that we had to sell the parents on the idea that we could provide them with a quality of education that they thought the children could get at their home school. So that's what we worked on. That's what we have delivered, and we continue to deliver that.

In a commencement address that he delivered in May, 1983, President Reagan singled out two principals whose work as educational leaders, he claimed, illustrated his belief that educational reform efforts do not need federal money or federal regulation to be successful. Saldago was one of the principals. The *New York Times* on May 24, 1983 commented:

Adan Saldago, the Texas principal, makes two points. Federal money is essential; without it, he could not have provided, among other things, a computer. Second, he praises Federal desegregation requirements. These have brought white middle-class enrollment. His school would have remained "the doormat of the district" otherwise.

Dedicated Teachers. The interaction between the student and the teacher and the learning climate within the classroom are, of course, the ultimate determinants of whether teaching and learning takes place. When the schools of these cities were first desegregated, there were many distractions to that teaching and learning process. Both teachers and students were being transferred and were having to adjust to new, unfamiliar surroundings, and to new associates and teaching and learning conditions. Obviously, not all the teachers (or all the administrators, or parents, or students) measured up to the stresses of the times. But testimony received by the NEA Inquiry Panel conveyed the message that, in each of the school systems, the teachers, like most of the other staff members, were united by a heightened sense of purpose and an awareness of the critical importance of the events they were experiencing. Heroic efforts were made by many teachers to ensure that teaching and learning did proceed in the newly desegregated classrooms.

In all three cities, also, the teachers organizations greatly assisted in the professional development of teachers during these times—through human relations seminars and workshops, programs to help teachers deal with stress, and morale-building efforts to lift the spirits and help sustain the top performance of the teaching staff. In Austin and Charlotte-Mecklenburg, the merger of the formerly Black and white teachers associations contributed significantly to the ability of teachers to work successfully after faculties were desegregated. Both the Austin Association of Teachers and the Seattle Teachers Association provided leadership to the community through their early and sustained advocacy of comprehensive and fair desegregation programs, developed with both parent and teacher involvement.

"If anyone is due the greater accolades for causing desegregation to be successful. . . . I think it has to be the teaching community in this city, which is very, very strong, and very, very professional."

WILL DAVIS, former board member, Austin Independent School District

"I think it took a school staff that was dedicated and that was willing to hang in there and adjust their teaching technique, and take inservice workshops, and that met the needs of students coming from divergent backgrounds."

CHRIS FOLK, Associate Superintendent for Communications, Charlotte-Mecklenburg public schools

Openness and civility of school board debate. The school board members who voted for desegregation—dependent on public support for reelection (and in Seattle for passage of school operating levies)—had to take risks, to be reasonable and civil in debate with each other, and to be open to the public. Testimony indicated that all three school boards did assume these responsibilities in a manner that helped to maintain civility of discourse throughout the school communities. Further, all three boards, ultimately, took the responsibility for employing strong superintendents capable of carrying out systemwide desegregation programs. The fact that there were differences of opinion on the school boards at the time the court orders came down (or, in Seattle, when the Plan was being debated) in a sense, helped to assure those who opposed busing, or were leery of it, that their views were being represented.

In Charlotte-Mecklenburg, school board meetings were televised once a month. During the height of the desegregation controversy, these meetings had high ratings. The

"The Seattle Teachers Association believes that desegregation is a necessary and welcome event which is long overdue in putting Seattle Public Schools on the path of meeting its obligation to provide quality education for students of all racial and ethnic backgrounds."

POSITION STATEMENT, Seattle Teachers Association, 1977-78

openness of the processes of deliberation and debate let the public in on the decision-making; thus, the community could more readily understand and identify with the final outcome of the decisions.

Positive media support for desegregation. In all three cities, the newspapers, television and radio played a highly supportive role throughout the desegregation process. In Charlotte and Austin there was some discussion on media sensationalism of the student disruptions during the first year of desegregation. But there was general acknowledgment that those events were covered legitimately and with considerable restraint by the local media. Television and radio stations offered free broadcast time for the airing of messages enlisting public support of the desegregation programs. In Austin, Superintendent Ellis held daily news conferences when the court-order was being implemented in 1980. Throughout the desegregation process, open communication was sustained between the school system and the communicators.

Metropolitan school desegregation. Two special circumstances in Charlotte and Austin facilitated the desegregation process and pointed the way to the importance of the metropolitan school district organization as a means of achieving real and lasting school desegregation. The Charlotte-Mecklenburg School District is a product of the 1960 consolidation of the city and county school systems. Thus, the city and suburban schools are all one large district, which has minimized the problems of white flight as a result of school desegregation. The Austin Independent School District, while not a product of total city-county merger, has annexed lands in Travis County surrounding the city, so that the AISD is approximately twice the size of Austin. In both school systems, therefore, the stability of school district enrollment has been increased, and the ghettoization of schools has been minimized by the broad city and county scope of desegregation programs.

Community and civic involvement. The history of segregation in Charlotte, Austin, and Seattle reveals a truth common to all of the nation's cities: The segregation of a city's neighborhoods and public schools was produced by the conscious collaboration of the leaders of the majority community. Thus, if the segregation is ever to be undone, this too will require the conscious collaboration of the leaders of the majority community—the city government, which is responsible for zoning and planning; the civic and business leaders (including the realtors) who influence municipal decisions; and the community leaders. Throughout this report, the involvement of all these groups in the desegregation process has been reported in detail. In each city, final school board decisions to carry out comprehensive desegregation plans were supported publicly (even if at the last minute) by the business

and civic leaders who comprised the city's power elite. In Charlotte, the election of a school board majority that would finally move to comply with the court order was influenced by those same leaders.

At another, but crucially important level, progressive and moderate community activists moved the citizens to accept and cooperate with the desegregation process. In Seattle, those community activists, in fact, moved the school system and the school board to get on with the task of adopting an equitable, citywide plan of fixed assignments. The intensity and intelligence of community activism in Seattle were of heroic magnitude. In all three cities, the desegregation of schools brought an unprecedented sense of unity and school involvement to the entire community. And in all three cities, citizens of different racial and ethnic groups working together began to respect and appreciate each other's differences; just as their children were beginning to do in the newly desegregated schools and classrooms.

I think that the kind of citizen demand for participation that occurred over the desegregation issues has laid the groundwork for much better quality of citizen involvement on school issues.

KAY BULLITT, first chair, Citizens Advisory Committee for Quality Integrated Education, Seattle, Washington

I think we have had the privilege in Austin, Texas of having our public in the public school system, and I believe

that we still have our public in the public schools, and I think that is something to be proud of.

CAROLE KEETON RYLANDER, former school board member, AISD, former Mayor, City of Austin

I think the success of Charlotte's desegregation of the schools is now a source of community pride . . . And out of that . . . has come a greater consciousness of the fact that this community can do things on an interracial basis . . . We were about to be a Black community and a white community in 1969 and 1970. We were defeating the bond issues, and there was no sense of community . . . It was Black on one side of town and white on the other. And out of [desegregation] has come much more linkage, a bridge that has made possible many other things. We have begun passing bond issues . . . I think the movement to have district representation on the City Council is a direct result of having desegregation . . . in the public school system . . .

In November 1977, we passed a referendum . . . to have districts in the city government (instead of the at-large representation that heavily favored the white community); and I think that was the result of our experience with desegregation and the feeling that . . . it's fair, why not. We have had enough encounters between people from all parts of the community to say—this is working, and it has helped us to make one community.

JACK CLAIBORNE, associate editor, The *Charlotte Observer*

4

Barriers To Integration

In the South as in the North, in this nation as in other nations, the history of social change is a history of conflict, for it is a universal tendency of society to deify its own traditions and to resist any challenge to the established social order. . . . Laws can be reformed but ingrained attitudes and the institutions that reflect those attitudes, are not remade so easily.[1]

The *Brown* decision of 1954, like the Civil Rights Act a decade later, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and the Fair Housing Act of 1968, required of this nation only that it yield to all Americans the rights it has always granted to some Americans. Yet, for Blacks and other minorities, these rights had been so long deferred that the mandate for their universal extension produced a struggle of revolutionary force. The school desegregation movement has been central to that struggle and must remain so, not only for explicit constitutional reasons, but for reasons having to do with our survival as one nation: The public schools, more than any other American institution, can be the place where the integration of our society begins*, simply by bringing children together when they are young enough to escape the yoke of racial prejudice and fear, and by teaching them the facts, rather than the myths, of history and of race.

If the nation chooses segregation—and doing nothing is accepting segregation—it faces a future as divided, angry, and separate peoples. If it chooses integration it will demonstrate that the majority in a free society can act to bring about

*In the making of a segregated society, the contribution of the public school was never overlooked.

institutional change remedying the enduring consequences of a history of discrimination, moving the cities beyond an issue that has been dividing the people and distracting attention from education, and beginning to build integrated schools. School desegregation may be merely a first bridge across the racial gulf, but it is the only bridge we can build in our generation. We must build it well.[2]

Through the desegregation of their schools, the citizens of Charlotte-Mecklenburg, Austin, and Seattle have succeeded in building a first bridge across the racial gulf that divides their communities. But school desegregation is not a static condition that, once attained, can be left unattended. Nor can it be sustained by mere attention to the statistics of racial balance.

Desegregation is a process that has to lead somewhere or, like a dead-end street, it will provide opportunity for nothing but reverse movement. And the direction in which desegregation must move, or face reversal, is toward integration.

The distinction between the desegregation of schools and their integration is a delicate one, hard to measure and hard to define—perhaps because the latter status has been so rarely achieved. But there are important differences: Desegregation has to do with the movement of students so that they are together in the same school system, the same school building, and the same classroom. Integration has to do with the creation of a learning climate in which students can begin to relate to each other naturally, as equals, recognizing that the racial and ethnic differences among them can mean less to that relationship than the many human ways in which they are alike. The integrated school system is not one in which the cultural and racial diversities of children are amalgamated, or homogenized, or assimilated; it is a system in which those diversities are mutually respected and appreciated.

The integration of public schools, however, like their desegregation, is a task gravely impeded by the fact that it is being undertaken within the context of a still segregated society.

NEIGHBORHOODS AND SCHOOLS

Housing has been segregated in this country, not by chance, but by the design of federal housing policies, municipal planning and development, zoning ordinances, housing industry practices, and individual choices. And the entire phenomenon of neighborhood racial segregation, including its connection to school segregation, started a long time ago.

For example—although there was no stated national housing policy before 1962, the federal government's endorsement of segregated housing and schooling is illustrated in this excerpt from a 1936 Federal Housing Administration (FHA) Underwriters' Manual:

The social class of the parents of children at the school will in many instances have a vital bearing. Thus, although physical surroundings of a neighborhood area may be favorable and conducive to enjoyable, pleasant living in its location, if the children of people living in such an area are compelled to attend school where the majority or a goodly number of the pupils represent **a far lower level of society or incompatible racial element,** *the neighborhood under consideration will prove far less stable and desirable than if this condition did not exist.*[3] *(emphasis added)*

To protect the children from exposure to these "lower levels" and "incompatible racial elements," the FHA manual had a creative suggestion—transportation to maintain race and class segregation:

In such an instance it might well be that for the payment of a fee, children of this area could attend another school with pupils of their same social class. The question for the Valuator to determine is the effect created by the necessity for making this payment upon the occupants of the location. Under any conditions the rating could not be as favorable as if the desirable school were available without additional costs. In many instances where a school has earned a prestige through the class of pupils attending, it will be found that such prestige will be a vital element in maintaining the desirability of the entire area comprising the school district.[4]

A 1983 report of the Citizens Commission on Civil Rights* provides an abundance of data to support its conclusion that for the past 50 years, national housing policies have consistently operated almost exclusively for the benefit of white Americans:

During the period when FHA mortgage assistance and other programs were operating full throttle, first to save the housing industry and then to finance suburban expansion, a "whites only" label was firmly affixed to these programs. Federal policymakers cooperated with state and local governments, real estate brokers, developers and financial institutions to assure that minorities were excluded from assistance designed to benefit the middle class and that low-income housing was provided only on a segregated basis. The federal government placed its imprimatur on the exclusionary and segregative practices of others and helped shape the current racial demography of the nation's cities. For the minorities, the government's housing policies meant that they were confined to ghettoes, lacking choice and access to the the jobs and services that would have afforded them the opportunity to become part of the mainstream.

The face of federal housing policy began to change in

*Citizens Commission on Civil Rights, Center for National Policy Review, Catholic University, Washington, D.C.

1968, with the passage of the Fair Housing Act (Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act), prohibiting discrimination in public and private housing, and the Housing and Urban Development Act, authorizing new housing programs for low and moderate-income families. That same year, a U.S. Supreme Court decision (*Jones v. Mayer*)[5] granted Blacks the right to seek legal redress against private as well as government discrimination in housing transactions.

Throughout the years since 1968, however, federal enforcement of nondiscriminatory housing policies has never been forceful enough to undo the harm that decades of discrimination have done.[6] And the law itself does not carry strong enforcement provisions. In its report, the Citizens Commission on Civil Rights points out the weaknesses of the law:

> *Title VIII established the national objective of fair housing and provided* **some** *of the mechanisms essential for achieving that goal. It created a right of private action for victims of discrimination . . . and gave the Attorney General authority to institute litigation where there was a pattern or practice of discrimination. A third road for seeking relief was provided through the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).* **The statute, however, merely authorized HUD to receive, investigate and conciliate complaints of housing discrimination. The failure to provide an administrative enforcement mechanism proved to be a serious flaw in the Act since the expense and delay involved in court litigation has deterred many victims of discrimination from taking that route.**[7] *(emphasis added)*

Further, government-financed urban renewal policies during the '60s did more to dislocate Blacks and relocate urban ghettoes than they did to renew the cities.

Given the history of generations of federally assisted racial discrimination in housing; and, more recently, the failure of the federal government to effectively enforce fair housing legislation, it is not surprising that in the 1980s, as in earlier years, the segregated housing patterns of the nation's cities and suburbs persist.

It is a bitter irony that public school systems now under court order to desegregate are decrying the segregated housing patterns that they, either tacitly or actively, once collaborated in establishing.

> *It is commonly understood that housing segregation results in segregated neighborhood schools. What is not commonly understood is that where schools are racially identifiable as black or white they tend to be used to steer prospective homeseekers to choose housing so that neighborhood and school segregation are perpetuated.*[8]

Judge McMillan in *Swann* and Judge Roberts in *Overton*, the Austin school desegregation case, found that the school

systems had consistently placed schools in areas easily accessible to racially isolated minority neighborhoods, with the foreseeable result that the schools would also be racially isolated. The location of these "walk-in" schools not only assured their own segregation, but because they were racially identifiable minority schools they served as a magnet to minorities, further increasing the ghettoization of urban neighborhoods.

In the face of this rapidly increasing influx and growth of the Mexican American population in East Austin and a concomitant emigration of Anglos, the AISD began to construct schools and draw attendance zone lines in East Austin with the foreseeable effect of creating predominantly Mexican American secondary schools as well as elementary schools. . . . The construction and opening of Johnston High School with a heavily Mexican American enrollment in a relatively undeveloped area in southeast Austin also had the effect of encouraging the expansion of Mexican American concentration in that direction.[9]

Witnesses in all three cities discussed with the NEA panel the various ways in which city planning and real estate practices have adversely affected school desegregation efforts. Among the kinds of actions that concerned them were the following:

- the enactment of zoning ordinances that restrict development in some areas to one unit for two or three acres of land, thus pricing the home site out of the reach of all but the affluent buyer
- the practice by realtors and home builders of steering prospective home buyers to predominantly minority or predominantly white neighborhoods depending upon their race
- realtors' promotion of suburban areas for their "acclaimed schools," with the implicit message that the suburban schools are not only better, but whiter, than the urban schools
- the concentration of low-income housing in predominantly minority neighborhoods.

A former Charlotte board member expressed concern that city planners seem unaware that the health of the school district is centrally important to the health of the city. She told of a Chamber of Commerce task force that has developed a study report on city plans for the 1990s; there was *nothing* in the plan about the schools, although the school system is the largest employer in the city and educates most of the city's children.

There are some promising signs of change: In Seattle, the city council and the school board have jointly adopted goals calling for coordinated action to encourage residential integration. Further the City of Seattle, which supported and

cooperated in the implementation of the Seattle Plan, has recently established a scattered-site low-income housing program.

In Austin, the Austin Independent School District (AISD) has asked that a joint committee be established by the school system and the city and county governing bodies to formulate plans that will alleviate increasing residential segregation of the northeast area. That area, once naturally integrated, was excluded from the 1980 desegregation plan. Since adoption of the plan, however, a combination of factors—an aging white population with fewer children, the real estate practice of steering white home-seekers past the northeast to predominantly white areas, and the movement into the area of minorities—has resulted in the northeast area schools' enrolling increasing numbers of minority students. One particular school, the L.B.J. High School has decreased in enrollment since 1974 from 1590 to 1172; and its white enrollment has decreased from 75 percent to 33 percent of the total enrollment.

The NEA panel met with representatives of the northeast community to hear their concerns that the school was about to become predominantly minority. Stephen Rodi, president of a neighborhood association within the northeast area, showed the panel listings of the 21 elementary schools in Austin having an enrollment less than 40 percent white. Of these, 17 are located in East Austin. His testimony illustrated the need for desegregated school systems to constantly monitor population shifts as they affect current and long range desegregation planning, to adjust student assignments or make other plans to ensure against resegregation of schools, and to work with city planners and realtors to formulate plans that will discourage white flight from integrating areas.

EXTRACURRICULAR BARRIERS

When our kids get out they are not going to be in a segregated world, . . . therefore we must provide the education and the knowledge and the information in which they can participate in the broader community and then compete. I think one must be able to participate before you start talking about competition.

DOROTHY HOLLINGSWORTH, former board member,
Seattle public schools

In Seattle, in Austin, and in Charlotte, minority students are having an opportunity to participate and compete in a wider world than existed in the segregated schools from which they transferred. However, many of those students are not participating and are not competing in activities that should contribute much to the value and the pleasure of school life. In schools that NEA panel members visited in all three cities,

they observed, and they were told, that minority students are seriously under-represented in most extracurricular activities, except for varsity sports. In band, in drama, in debate, in choirs, and in other such activities, white students consistently predominate.

Most extracurricular activities are scheduled for either the early morning before school, or late afternoon after school. For those students who do not have their own transportation, the opportunity to take part in extracurricular activites is dependent upon available transportation. The school systems do provide late and early buses for students who are participating in extracurricular activities; however, testimony to the panel indicated that the service is not sufficient, except perhaps for varsity sports.

Since the elimination of Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) funds, which did support after-school transportation programs, these programs have had to be curtailed.

The loss to minority students of these important school activities is a serious one. For most students, extracurricular activities provide much of the fun of school and of youth. Equally important, they give students a sense of identification with their school and of healthy interaction with other students that they otherwise might never feel. Whether their lack of participation is due to transportation problems; to the inability to afford the expenses of some activities that may involve student fees; or to a sense of insecurity in competing with white students, it is important that principals, teachers, and counselors discover what the inhibiting factors are and assist the students in overcoming them. It is also essential that desegregated school systems ensure that the provision of sufficient transportation services is part of their total commitment to quality integrated education.

The testimony of school administrators and teachers indicated that all three school systems are aware of and trying to overcome the barriers to integration of extracurricular activities, though they have not yet found the necessary resources to do the job. Austin's assistant superintendent Charles Akins, the Black former principal of a formerly predominantly-white high school, talked with the NEA panel about the preparations that had been made when the comprehensive school desegregation plan was first instituted to ensure that the students transported in would not be excluded—or feel excluded—from extracurricular activities:

The parents . . . were concerned about the academics, but they were concerned about whether their youngsters would be allowed to participate fully in all activities. . . These were not trivial things. It is very explosive when a youngster is a cheerleader at one school and will not become a cheerleader at another school. . . . The same thing was true for the drill team or dance group . . . and the band. If they were handpersons at the other school, through the auditions and

the spring and summer practices, they would have to be the same . . . at the school they would now become a part of. . . . So, we worked at those things . . . so the youngsters would feel, "Look, this is our school as well."

BARRIERS OF LANGUAGE

[T]here is no equality of treatment merely by providing students with the same facilities, textbooks, teachers, and curriculm; for students who do not understand English are effectively foreclosed from any meaningful education.

Lau v. Nichols[10]

In this 1974 decision, the U.S. Supreme Court held that under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and its implementing regulations, the states have an obligation to provide equal educational opportunity for all children, including the responsiblity to take "affirmative steps to rectify the language deficiency in order to open programs to these children."[11]

By this ruling, the Court affirmed what students with limited English proficiency have learned through bitter experience: that equal access to educational opportunity can be as severely impeded by language barriers as it can by the barriers of racial segregation. Nevertheless, there are those who see potential conflict between the goals of the two court decisons—desegregation in *Brown* and bilingual education in *Lau*.

Some supporters of bilingual instruction have expressed concern that the dispersal of students in desegregated schools will place such a small number of language minority students in individual schools that the school systems will claim that it is not economically possible to provide adequate bilingual instruction. Desegregation proponents have responded that the separation of students in bilingual education may, in fact, result in their resegregation. And then there are other critics, hostile to the mandates of both *Brown* and *Lau*, who are exploiting this entire issue as a means of dividing civil rights groups.

The issue was addressed by those who met with the NEA panel in Austin and Seattle; their consensus was that the preservation of bilingual and bicultural education in a desegregated system is essential and can be accomplished if sufficient knowledgeable attention and resources are committed to this purpose. Mako Nakagawa, of the Japanese American Student League in Seattle, expressed this very clearly:

The first duty of educators is to educate all children. If they need a second language, that language should be taught. If they need special attention, that should be taught. Now if we have to regroup some kids at some point, for some special needs, certainly we should do that . . . and be a separate

class. But there is a big difference between separation and segregation. To say either/or to bilingual education and desegregation is silly.

Desegregation and bilingual education in the past 10 years have each raised and addressed vital educational and equity issues. It is essential that the two concerns begin to converge. They are not mutually exclusive, although special consideration must be given to the avoidance of conflict between the two. As Mako Nakagawa said, separation is different from segregation; it has entirely different purposes and entirely different results. Separation of students is a method of applying concentrated effort to the accomplishment of a specific and highly specialized, instructional task; it is temporary and it is often part-time. Many programs separating students for bilingual education classes bring students together for courses in which language is less important, such as art, music, and physical education.

Neither Seattle, with its multiplicity of racial and ethnic groups, nor Austin, with its tri-ethnic mix of students, has assigned "either/or" status to desegregation and bilingual education. Testimony indicated that both school systems are engaged in an effort to deal effectively with these two central issues of educational equity. And their effort is critically important. Hispanics in Austin and Asians in Seattle comprise the groups of major population increase—a population trend common to many urban areas throughout the nation.

In Seattle, the desegregation plan calls for the transfer of "neighborhoods" of students and for the assignment of minority students in large enough groups that they maintain a sense of cohesiveness and ethnic identity. Even so, in some instances, students have to be transferred out of the regular patterns of assignment in order to enter bilingual programs. Both school districts operate transitional programs of bilingual education, moving the students along from their native language into the English language, at the same time providing instruction in the native language. The scope and purpose of this study did not permit a detailed examination of this program.

In Austin, in addition to the bilingual programs offered at desegregated schools, a special schoolwide bilingual program is provided at a southeast Austin school, Allison Elementary School, which was excluded from the original desegregation plan and which, as a result, remains predominantly minority. Eugenio Hinojosa, principal at Allison, spoke of the program to the panel:

We currently have 15 kids per classroom . . . totally self-contained, no pullouts of any kind except special education.

Achievement has drastically gone up in our school in the past three and a half years. We currently have a dual language program. All the kids are given the opportunity at

registration time to learn both languages, English and Spanish . . . or just to get a straight English curriculum. Currently, out of 430 children (84 percent Hispanic, 15 percent Black, one percent white), only five are not in the dual language program.

Although Allison remains a minority segregated school, the students in the neighborhood of that school are assigned to desegregated settings for nine of their 13 years of public school.

Similar dual language programs are offered in eight Austin schools. The goal set by the school system is to have bilingual education instruction at all of its 60 elementary schools by the year 1986-87.

In Seattle, the NEA Inquiry Panel met with members of the Asian community, who expressed support of the Seattle Plan and appreciation for the diverse experience and socialization skills that it has provided their children. Although this community chose to be included in the Plan at its inception, some of the Asian citizens continue to be concerned about the dispersal of students and the loss of cultural identity that they believe the students are experiencing. Bettie Luke Kan of the Asian Community Education Task Force spoke of these concerns to the panel:

[There] was more of a chance after the first couple of years of deseg to mainstream instead of maintain a bilingual program. . . . Included in the efforts to mainstream, some of the negative effects included the loss of ethnic identity. The children are exhibiting more rejection of their Asian culture and they are picking up more and more . . . of the bad language, being ashamed of their appearance and ashamed of their culture.

We see another negative aspect of the Asians being pitted against Blacks and other minority students, a comparison of the good minority versus the bad minority. Sometimes the Asians are the "good" minority . . . quiet, academic, well-behaved and all this. . . . At times the Black students are the "good" minority, because at least they speak English and they are American, so this crazy flip-flop of being pitted.

It is clear that desegregation for all groups cannot be achieved without problems or without some sacrifice and trade-off. The alternative, however, is deepening isolation and alienation of the various races and ethnic groups in our society. It should also be clear that the problem of intergroup relationships can be minimized—and desegregation can create the conditions for a positive learning experience for all groups—by school systems that commit sufficient resources to carefully and sensitively designed human relations training programs for students and staff. In all three school districts included in this study, training of this kind was provided, largely supported by federal Emergency School Aid Act

(ESAA) funds at the outset of desegregation. In Seattle, ESAA-funded training was supplemented by extensive staff development programs in this area provided by the Community Relations Service of the Department of Justice. Once again, curtailment and elimination of those funds and services have led to the virtual elimination of human relations training.

The importance to this nation of both bilingual education and desegregation can be seen in their ultimate convergence of purpose. Aside from the explicit legal mandate of equal access to educational opportunity, their common goal is to help the nation, finally, make use of the resources of human talent and skill that, historically, have been neglected, allowed to stagnate in racial and linguistic ghettoes. It is bitterly ironic that this country, with its vast diversity of races and nationalities, should remain largely monolingual. Through the leadership of public school systems such as those included in this study, and through quality integrated education for all students, such squandering of human resources can be ended; and the nation will be the richer.

CURRICULAR BARRIERS

I am involved in the curriculum. And rather than having a Black history month . . . and a Martin Luther King celebration, if we can teach our children daily, based on the material they have in the textbooks—give them a picture of history that includes the contributions of Blacks, the contributions of the Indians, the contributions of minorities . . . all contributions from all people, and make them an integrated part of the curriculum; then I think we can teach the children all the time every day.

RUTH COHEN, elementary principal,
Charlotte, North Carolina

The NEA panel visited schools at all three study locations; and in most of the schools, discussions with teachers and principals and observation of classrooms and the hall decorations revealed that the schools do concern themselves with mementoes and studies of the histories of various minorities. It appeared that the extent of such studies depended upon the building staff members.

But a truly integrated curriculum was not widely in evidence, nor could there be one if it were to rely on textbooks. Historically, the perspectives and contributions of minorities and women have been excluded from most textbooks used in public schools today. Although minorities and women's groups have many times protested the pale and bland version of history and literature that most textbooks present, their efforts to make changes have met with limited success. According to Frances FitzGerald in her comprehensive

review of American history textbooks, *America Revised*, textbook publishers, in a timid attempt to include something of the history of minorities without giving offense to a powerful majority, portray severe "problems" without causes and epic "struggles," without mention of what the struggles might be against:

The Chicano farmworkers are struggling, but some texts fail to mention the growers. The American Indians are struggling in a void, there being no mention of the historical arrangements between private corporations and the Bureau of Indian Affairs for the exploitation of natural resources on the tribal lands. In regard to the civil rights movement, there is often no discussion of institutional racism—not even that which was contained in the Southern school systems before Little Rock.[12]

Until America's textbooks are revised and rewritten to include the history of all the peoples in this country, or until educators give up on the existing textbooks and design their own multicultural curriculum (as some have done in some of the schools visited by the panel), the content of public education in this country will not be integrated.

BARRIERS OF CLASS AND CASTE

Some of the most perplexing problems complicating the task of desegregation in Charlotte-Mecklenburg, Austin, and Seattle are problems common to desegregating school systems. They are not new, but are simply being noticed by the majority community for the first time. They are, in fact, problems that the act of school desegregation itself has uncovered. They have to do with the painful outcomes of educational neglect, entrenched through generations of racial segregation. And they involve the tortuous struggle of the public school institution to shape its program and its attitudes to meet the needs of young people whom it never before regarded or served as equals.

"Many of the children . . . come from single parent families or foster homes. Many are urban migrants. They spend two months in our school, move on to another school for two months and then return. Many come from homes where alcoholism is a way of life. Many of them are abused. Most of them are confused. We expect these same children to shed their problems at the school door and to become perfect little Dicks and Janes. . . . Concord, in order to be a safe place for children to learn, desperately needs a full-time counselor, a full-time librarian, and a nurse that can be at our school more than one day a week."

JUANA AUGEROT, elementary school principal, Seattle

The problems, as difficult as any the systems have to face, are exemplified by the facts outlined here.

In all three of these school districts, and in desegregated school districts across the country, the following situations persist:

- Segregated classrooms exist. In gifted and talented classes, the majority of the students are white. In regular and lower track classes, the majority of the students are Black or Hispanic.
- Although the achievement test score gap between minority and white students has narrowed since desegregation, the gap still exists.
- Suspension and expulsion rates remain higher for Black and Hispanic students than for whites.

- Dropout rates remain higher for Black and Hispanic students than for whites.
- Student retention rates remain higher for Black and Hispanic students than for whites.

Teachers and administrators in all three school systems talked about these problems with the NEA Inquiry Panel. Programs have been instituted in all three systems to identify talented minority students, to encourage and motivate achievement, and to establish clear-cut behavioral standards and discipline policies, with due process provisions. Administrators told the panel that efforts are being made to ensure that all students—of all racial and ethnic groups—understand what is expected of them and, equally important, understand that they will be dealt with honestly and fairly, though with firmness. This is not to say, however, in these school systems or in others, that policies formulated in good faith are always carried out. Institutions and individuals and attitudes do not change so quickly.

Problems remain for minority students, which are not easily documented or resolved. These problems involve the day-to-day stresses that minority students experience as a result of their encounters with the racism of the society itself, and with the sometimes unconscious cruelties of white students, teachers, and administrators. Further, these students bring with them to school the scars of past educational neglect and the sometimes painful experiences of their own lives away from school. Strapped as they are for funding, public schools do not have the resources to meet the needs of these students.

Perhaps in reaction to the general liberalizing of curriculum and easing of standards during the 1960s and '70s—and with some justification—school systems throughout the country are rigorously pursuing a back-to-basics program, with heavy emphasis on student discipline, testing, and on the easily measurable aspects of educational quality.

In following this course, it is important for school leaders, and all school personnel who work with students, to be particularly careful to retain their sensitivity to the human dimensions of teaching and learning, and to the particular needs of those students who have been the victims of educational neglect.

The fact of desegregation revealed these needs and these problems; the fact of desegregation now makes it possible and imperative for public school systems to respond to them in positive ways. As that task progresses, the process of school integration will begin.

"[In] all my classes, I was the only Black in there . . . and maybe one Mexican. . . . And it seems to me that after awhile, you know, sometimes people say, 'I can't believe this Black girl is in this class.' . . . They didn't really think I would be able to handle the work, but I was. And I had to prove myself. . . . And the attitude of most minorities is, 'We have got to show them that we can do just as well as they can.'"

VIRGINIA STEWART, high school student, Austin

"The competency test for me, this test raises the educational philosophy question—if the student does not learn, has the teacher taught? It would appear to me that placing a Black youngster into a desegregated classroom, having usually bused him many miles to get him there, and then requiring him to pass a test which has often been declared racially biased is certainly requiring a great deal, if not too much of our children."

THE REVEREND HERMAN L. THOMAS, Charlotte

MONITORING—FOR THE SAKE OF INTEGRATION

If you're going to attribute the Seattle Plan's success to any one element, I think it is that it has had such beautiful commitment from the minority communities.

MAKO NAKAGAWA, president,
Japanese American Student League

The desegregation programs of these three school districts were successful in design and in implementation largely because they were the product of enthusiastic collaborative effort of the school staff and a broad range of community representatives. In talking with some of these citizens who had been so deeply involved in the creation of the plans and putting them into place, the panel sensed that there is a tendency to look nostalgically back to the time of involvement, but to regard the desegregation of schools now as a finished item of business. The fact is, if the communities continue to look upon desegregation as a finished item of business, desegregation will become another item on an already long list of unfinished educational tasks facing America.

Desegregation must be the community's continuing business. What appears to be missing from these communities is an ongoing process of monitoring the implementation of the plan and the revisions that are made, as they must be made, to ensure the stability and integrity of the plan.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

5

"Forming the Future"

My oldest daughter was entering the first grade when the Brown ***decision was announced. Naively, I thought that this would mean that my children would be able to attend integrated schools. Now my children have children. Maybe by the time*** their ***children are ready to go to school, we will have finally done it—integrated the public schools in this country.***

DOROTHY JONES, member of the NEA Inquiry Panel

Thirty years since *Brown*, from one decade to another, children in one school district after another have been denied their constitutional rights. These losses can never be recovered. The continued abridgement of the rights of children cannot be tolerated. This nation cannot afford to sacrifice future generations.

This inquiry reaffirms the need for a renewed national commitment to the achievement of quality integrated education in all of the nation's public schools.

The experiences of Charlotte-Mecklenburg, Austin, and Seattle, as described in this report, demonstrate that the first critically important part of this task—school desegregation—can be successfully accomplished, with beneficial results to education and to the entire community. Among the benefits clearly evident in the three cities are the following:

- Achievement gains for all students, with Black and Hispanic students increasingly closing the test score gap that had been entrenched in segregation.
- Elimination of inequities in buildings, facilities, and educational resources that had been built into the segregated systems.

- Exposure of problems needing resolution which were not dealt with, nor even acknowledged, prior to desegregation.

- Growth in respect and understanding among students of different groups as they learn to ork together and to appreciate the values of diversity.

- Increased community pride and greater willingness among adults to accept people of other groups.

- Educational reform and innovation: desegregation has been the stimulus for the beginning of the integration of curriculum and has required staff development programs to increase the human relations skills and sensitivities of school personnel who work with students.

- The development of a new generation of school leaders who understand and have staked their careers on the achievement of effective desegregation and integration.

This report has recounted in some detail the many kinds of things that various school and community groups—teachers and school administrators, parents, students, civic and community groups, churches, neighborhood organizations, and others—have done, working together, to carry out comprehensive, successful desegregation programs. The central components of desegregation success, which are exemplary for all school districts, have ' uded the following:

- Strong and effective leadership from the superintendent.

- Formulation of a desegregation plan that promises fairness.

- Careful staff preparation for desegregation.

- Skillful leadership of principals and other administrators in individual schools.

- Dedicated and effective teachers; involvement and leadership of the teachers associations in desegregation plans and programs.

- Positive media support; and open, continuous school communications with the media and with the public.

- Effective leadership of school boards; openness and civility of school board debate.

- Community involvement in developing and monitoring the desegregation plan, including effective work by community leaders to assist school personnel, students, and citizens to prepare for, and deal with, the changes that desegregation brings.

- Active, vocal, and organized support of civic leaders.

- Leadership development and human relations skills training for students to help them work effectively with each

other and provide leadership within their schools and communities for successful desegregation.

Even after the desegregation plan is in place, local school systems and their communities must continue to attend to desegregation concerns. School desegregation is not something that, once achieved, can be forgotten as if it were finished business.

In order to avert resegregation and the creeping in of inequities and weaknesses that can destroy earlier successes, a desegregation plan requires constant monitoring and fine-tuning by school people, with the active, watchful involvement of civil rights and other community groups.

Also of great importance to the success of desegregation—and the achievement of integration—is the active cooperation of city government, and the combined effort of city planners, school leaders, and real estate developers in working to eliminate segregated housing patterns, which continue to obstruct desegregation efforts.

The panel's inquiry showed that, although education is a responsibility of the states, only one of the three school districts, Seattle, received technical assistance at the time of desegregation from its state department of public instruction. Leadership and assistance from the state are major assets to any desegregation program, not only in its implementation, but in the subsequent necessary transition to school integration.

ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The degree to which all desegregation efforts are successful and able to be sustained, however, will be determined by the strength of leadership, enforcement, and support provided by the federal government. Such aid was pivotal in all three cities.

Everything that local and state educational systems do to achieve desegregation is conditioned by what the federal government does or does not do to make *Brown* a reality.

At issue here is the present retreat of the national Administration from its obligation to enforce Constitutional rights and to lead this nation in the effort to ensure equality of educational opportunity for all students.

- This Administration constantly reiterates that "busing" does not work. But busing is used to assist students who are reassigned under desegregation plans. And desegregation as this study, and other similar studies demonstrate, is working.

- This Administration not only refuses to enforce the law, but repeatedly seeks to undermine the law as articulated in *Brown* and further developed through 30 years of implementing decisions.

- This Administration in 1981 reversed the position of the previous administration and argued before the Supreme Court in support of an anti-busing statute in the State of Washington, a statute which the Court ruled unconstitutional. Had the statute been upheld by the Supreme Court, it would have resulted in dismantlement of the Seattle school desegregation plan.

- This Administration stated, in 1982, that it would accept the Johnston-Helms rider to the Department of Justice appropriation authorization bill—a rider that sought to tie the hands of the Justice Department in enforcing desegregation plans through the courts, and that sought to tie the hands of the courts in prescribing remedies for the violation of constitutional rights.

- This Administration's deep cuts of all education appropriations and the absorption of Emergency School Aid Act funding into block grants has virtually eliminated essential federal support for local desegregation efforts.

- This Administration has continuously ignored its constitutional obligation to implement through the Department of Education and the Department of Justice a vigorous and effective enforcement program in the area of desegregation based on relevant civil rights laws and court orders; and it has persistently refused to release civil rights data on students and faculty in public schools.

- This Administration's consistent reiteration of the unsupported allegation that desegregation doesn't work and its willingness to support anti-busing appropriation riders has provided an excuse to some local and state officials, as well as community leaders, to put less and less emphasis on the drive for desegregation and equal educational opportunity.

The following recommendations are designed to once again put the federal government in the forefront of the drive to achieve throughout the nation the goal of *Brown v. Board of Education*.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The court decisions and the laws needed to desegregate schools successfully already exist; what is needed now are government officials willing to enforce the laws, to assist and encourage school systems in desegregation efforts, and to lead the nation in the achievement of quality integrated education.

As the chief executive officer of the United States, the President must approve a plan of action with goals and timetables for achieving desegregation of the nation's schools in accordance with the mandate of *Brown v. Board of*

Education and the subsequent implementing decisions of the federal courts.

In order to achieve this objective the President should:

1. Direct the Secretary of Education to submit for approval, and then implement, a plan of action including goals and timetables for the timely accomplishment of school desegregation.

2. Direct the Secretary of Education to initiate administrative proceedings leading to prompt cutoff of all federal funds in school districts where segregation and discrimination still exist.

3. Direct the Secretary of Education to collect and report promptly to the public on student and faculty civil rights data in individual school districts.

4. Direct the Attorney General to support the Secretary of Education in implementing the plan of action for desegregation by exercising the authority vested in him by law to initiate proceedings in federal courts against school districts that persist in following segregation policies.

5. Direct the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, as the lead agency in the field of equal employment, to support the Secretary of Education in implementing the President's plan for desegregation by developing and implementing a plan for the vigorous enforcement of equal employment opportunity laws in the public schools of the nation.

6. Request the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights to monitor and to report annually on progress or lack of progress in implementing the President's plan of action for desegregation in accordance with the goals and timetables.

7. Direct the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to submit a plan of action with goals and timetables for the desegregation of housing—a step that is essential to insure right of access to housing but a step that would also help to accelerate desegregation of schools

Also, in order to achieve the objective of desegregation of the nation's schools the Congress should:

1. Consistent with its oversight responsibilities, evaluate the progress or lack of progress that agencies in the executive branch are making in implementing the civil rights laws passed by the Congress.

2. Reestablish categorical aid for desegregation of school districts, including the renewal of the provisions of the former Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) to provide for continuing needs of desegregating school districts.

3. Demonstrate support of public education and desegregation by rejecting efforts to curtail the authority of the courts and the Department of Justice to enforce desegregation and civil rights laws.

4. Repeal the Eagleton-Biden rider to the Department of Education appropriation bill which forbids the Department of Education from requiring desegregation plans where compliance would require transportation of pupils beyond the school nearest their residence.

5. Amend the Fair Housing Act to establish an administrative process to permit victims of housing discrimination to secure relief without the necessity of filing lawsuits.

* * *

An independent, bi-partisan U.S. Commission on Civil Rights should be charged with the responsibility of monitoring the actions of both the executive and legislative branches and to submit periodically recommendations to the President and the Congress regarding actions that should be taken to accelerate the implementation of *Brown v. Board of Education*.

* * *

Vigorous leadership by the President with effective support by the Congress can open the doors of educational opportunity for children and young people who otherwise, because of segregation, will find those doors shut. Continued delays in opening those doors mean that for many children and young people the doors will never be opened. This will be tragic for them. It will also be tragic for the nation. We will be deprived of the contribution they are capable of making. The United States has the capability of implementing *Brown v. Board of Education*. We must not wait another 30 years to do so.

FOOTNOTES

Chapter 1

1. *Desegregation of Black and Hispanic Students from 1968 to 1980.* Prepared by Gary Orfield for the Joint Center for Political Studies, Washington, D.C., 1982. Table 10.

2. 402 U.S. 1 (1971).

3. Final Order (Swann Song) in *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education.*

4. Siqueland, Ann LeGrelius, *Without a Court Order.* Madrona Publishers, Seattle, Washington, 1981. p. 4.

Chapter 2

1. Richard Kluger, *Simple Justice.* Random House, New York, N.Y., 1975. p. 724. (From the brief offered by the State of Florida, one of the six states that filed *Amicus Curiae* briefs in the final *Brown* arguments.)

2. Laughlin McDonald, *Racial Equality.* National Textbook Co., Skokie, Ill., and American Civil Liberties Union, New York, New York, 1977. p. 57.

3. United States Commission on Civil Rights, *With All Deliberate Speed: 1954-19??.* Clearinghouse Publication 69, 1981, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1976. p. 4.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 12.

5. United States Commission on Civil Rights, *Fulfilling the Letter and Spirit of the Law.* U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1976. p. 4.

6. McDonald, *op. cit.*, p. 59.

7. Larry Jinks, "Integration Seen Bolstering Law." *Charlotte Observer*, July 1957.

8. Frye Gaillard and Polly Paddock, "Out of Court and Into the Future—With Hope." *The Charlotte Observer*, July 12, 1975. p. 1.

9. 402 U.S. 1, 29 (1971).

10. Gaillard and Paddock, *op. cit.*

11. *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education*, 369 F.2d 29 (1966).

12. 391 U.S. 430, 442 (1968).

13. 396 U.S. 19, 20 (1969).

14. Gaillard and Paddock, *op. cit.*

15. *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education* 402 U.S. 1, (1971).

16. Vilma S. Martinez, "Chicanos and Equal Educational Opportunity." *Continuing Challenge: The Past and the Future of Brown v. Board of Education.* The University of Notre Dame Center for Civil Rights, Integrated Education Associates, Evanston, Illinois, 1975. p. 60.

17. *Ibid.*, p. 59.

18. Memorandum Opinion and Order. *United States and Overton v. Texas Education Agency* (Austin Independent School District) C.A. A-70-CA-80, 1979.

19. 467 F.2d 848, 885 (5th Cir. 1972) (en banc).

20. 532 F.2d 380, 392 (5th Cir. 1976).

21. Memorandum Opinion and Order, *United States and Overton v. Texas Education Agency* (Austin Independent School District) C.A. A-70-CA-80, 1979.

22. Guillermo Garcia, "1800 Hear Anti-Busing Speeches." *Austin American Statesman*, Austin, Texas, December 13, 1979.

23. Donaleran Maines, "Students: 'We Won't Go.'" *Austin Citizen*, December 10, 1979.

24. Siqueland, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

25. *Ibid.*, p. 5.

26. Robert L. Williams and Frank Hanawalt, *The History of Desegregation in Seattle Public Schools, 1954-1981.* Seattle Public Schools, Seattle Washington, 1981. p. 2.

27. *Ibid.*, p. 4.

28. "The Road to Desegregation." Unpublished paper prepared by Seattle Municipal League, 1979.

29. *Ibid.*

30. Siqueland, *op. cit.*, pp. 80-81.

31. *Ibid.*, p. 104.

32. "School Desegregation Seattle Style." Unpublished paper by Stephen F. Mullin, 1983. p. 59.

33. Siqueland, *op. cit.*, pp. 46-47.

34. "The Road to Desegregation," *op. cit.*

35. Siqueland, *op. cit.*, p. 50.

Chapter 3

1. Gary Orfield, *Must We Bus?* The Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C., 1978. p. 454.

Chapter 4

1. National Education Association, *Beyond Desegregation: The Problem of Power, A Special Study in East Texas.* Washington, D.C., February 1970. p. 35.

2. Orfield, *op cit.*, p. 455.

3. United States Federal Housing Administration, *Underwriting Manual, Underwriting and Valuation Procedure Under Title II of the National Housing Act.* Paragraph 228, April 1936 revised edition, November 1936. (As quoted in Citizens Commission on Civil Rights, *A Decent Home. A Report on the Continuing Failure of the Federal Government to Provide Equal Housing Opportunity.* Center for National Policy Review, Catholic University Law School, Washington, D.C., 1983. p. 8.)

4. *Ibid.*

5. 392 U.S. 409 (1968).

6. Citizens Commission on Civil Rights, *op cit.*

7. *Ibid.*, pp. 27-28.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 45.

9. Memorandum Opinion and Order, *U.S. & Overton v. Texas Education Agency.* (Austin Independent School District) C.A. A-70-CA-80. p. 45.

10. 414 U.S. 563 (1974).

11. *Ibid.*

12. Frances FitzGerald, *America Revised.* Little Brown & Co., Boston, 1979. pp. 101-102.

APPENDIX 1

Participants—Open Hearings

Charlotte-Mecklenburg December 5-7, 1983

1. **Mr. Kelly Alexander, Jr.**
   Member, National Board of Directors, NAACP
2. **Ms. Helen Allison**
   Counselor, Harding High School, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools
3. **Mr. Jim Babb**
   Executive Vice President, Jefferson Broadcasting Company
4. **Mr. Kevin Barris**
   Editor, Employee Publications, North Carolina National Bank
5. **Ms. Meredith Barton**
   Student, Sedgefield Junior High School, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools
6. **Ms. Jacqueline Berry**
   Teacher, Briarwood Elementary School, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools
7. **Mr. Michael Berry**
   Student, Ranson Junior High School, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools
8. **Ms. Renee Berry**
   Student, West Charlotte High School, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools
9. **Ms. Jeanne Bohn**
   Director of Community Affairs, WSOC-TV
10. **Ms. Martha Brock**
    Parent
11. **Ms. Nichole Brock**
    Student, Irwin Avenue Elementary School, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools
12. **Mr. Jack Bullard**
    Staff Director, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Community Relations Committee
13. **Mr. Julius LeVonne Chambers, Esq.**
    Attorney; Legal Counsel for Plantiffs in *Swann*; President, NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc.
14. **Dr. K.Z. Chavis**
    Associate Executive Secretary, North Carolina Association of Educators
15. **Mr. Jack Claiborne**
    Associate Editor, *Charlotte News and Observer*
16. **Ms. Ruth Cohen**
    Assistant Principal, Sharon Junior High School, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools
17. **Ms. Barbara Cox**
    Local citizen
18. **Ms. Jacquelyn Cox**
    Teacher, Alexander Graham Junior High School, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools
19. **Ms. Kathleen Crosby**
    Area Superintendent, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools
20. **Mr. Bill Culp**
    Former Teacher, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools; Supervisor of Elections, Mecklenburg County
21. **Ms. Elizabeth Ross Dargan**
    Principal, Barringer Elementary School, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools
22. **Mr. Calvin Davis**
    Assistant Superintendent for Auxiliary Services, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools
23. **Mr. Robert L. Davis, Jr.**
    Principal, Spaugh Junior High School, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools
24. **Ms. Barbara Dellinger**
    Assistant to the Director, Bethlehem Center Methodist Mission Program

25. **Mr. George Dunlap**
Former Staff Member, Project Aries; School Resource Officer, Charlotte Police Department

26. **Dr. Chris Folk**
Assistant Superintendent for Communications, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools

27. **Rev. LaMar Foster**
Pastor, Second Calvary Baptist Church

28. **Mr. O.N. Freeman**
Former Principal and Administrative Assistant, Personnel, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools

29. **Ms. Karen Gaddy**
Member, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education

30. **Mr. Art Garrigus**
Counselor, Alexander Junior High School, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools

31. **Dr. Warner Hall**
Former Chair, Charlotte-Mecklenberg Community Relations Committee

32. **Dr. Robert Hanes**
Deputy Superintendent, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools

33. **Mr. W. T. Harris**
Former Chair, Board of County Commissioners, Mecklenburg County

34. **Dr. Reginald Hawkins**
Dentist; Pastor, Metropolitan United Presbyterian Church

35. **Mr. Andrew (Sam) Haywood**
Area Superintendent, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools

36. **Mr. Keith Howey**
Teacher, Druid Hills Elementary School; President, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Association of Educators

37. **Ms. Marylyn Huff**
Former Member, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education

38. **Ms. Kitty Huffman**
Former Regional Director, National Conference of Christians and Jews

39. **Ms. Adelaide Hunt**
Program Director, Gethsemane AME Enrichment Program

40. **Ms. Sis Kaplan**
Former Chair, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Community Relations Committee; Owner/Operator, Two Radio Stations

41. **Mr. Ken Koontz**
Owner/Consultant, Public Relations Agency

42. **Ms. Beverly Glover Logan**
Coordinator, Program for Disadvantaged Students, Myers Park High School, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools

43. **Ms. Joan P. Maultby**
Regional Director, National Conference of Christians and Jews

44. **Mr. Wendell McCain**
Student, Alexander Junior High School, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools

45. **Mr. John McLaughlin**
Member, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education

46. **Ms. Bettye McLaurin**
Principal, Sedgefield Elementary School, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools

47. **Hon. James McMillan**
Judge, United States District Court

48. **Ms. Cindy Medlin**
Student, Alexander Junior High School, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools

49. **Ms. Linda Medlin**
Parent

50. **Dr. James Mikkelson**
Human Relations Specialist, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools

51. **Ms. Antonia Wallace Moore**
Teacher, Sedgefield Junior High; District President, North Carolina Association of Educators

52. **Mr. Bruce Owens**
Principal, Elizabeth Traditional Elementary School, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools

53. **Mr. William Poe, Esq.**
Attorney; Former Chair, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education

54. **Mr. James K. Polk**
Former Staff Member, Project Aries

55. **Ms. Elizabeth Randolph**
Former Principal and Administrator, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools

56. **Ms. Margaret Ray**
Open School Coordinator, West Charlotte High School, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools

57. **Ms. Nancy Robbins**
Teacher, Western Hills Elementary School, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools

58. **Dr. Jay Robinson**
Superintendent, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools

59. **Mr. James Ross**
Former Staff Member, Project Aries

60. **Ms. Dorothy Counts Scoggins**
Director, Child Development Center; Former Student involved in desegregation

61. **Mr. S.W. Scott**
Principal, Starmount Elementary School, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools

62. **Ms. Marie Still**
Teacher, Spaugh Junior High School, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools

63. **Mr. Gerson Stroud**
Former Principal and Desegregation Specialist, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools

64. **Dr. Herman L. Thomas**
Associate Minister, First Baptist Church West

65. **Ms. Beatrice Thompson**
News Reporter, WBTV

66. **Ms. Beth Wallace**
Former Teacher, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools

67. **Ms. Carrie Winter**
Chair, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education

68. **Ms. Mildred Wright**
Principal, Ashley Park Elementary School, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools

Austin January 9-11, 1984

1. **Dr. Charles Akins**
Assistant Superintendent, School and Community Relations, Austin Independent School District (AISD)

2. **Ms. Barbara Alexis**
Community Education Administrator and Campus Coordinator, AISD

3. **Mr. M.J. "Andy" Anderson**
Austin Businessman and Broker in Real Estate and Investments

4. **Ms. Vivian Axel**
Teacher, First Grade, Allison Elementary School, AISD

5. **Mr. Gonzalo Barrientos**
State Representative, District 51, Texas House of Representatives

6. **Ms. Ellen Bell**
Principal, Highland Park Elementary School, Austin Association of Public School Administrators (AAPSA) Member, AISD

7. **Ms. Cara Best**
Graduate, Johnston High School, AISD

8. **Mr. William Bingham, Esq.**
General Counsel, AISD Board of Trustees (McGinnis, Lochridge, & Kilgore Law Firm)

9. **Mr. Samuel Biscoe, Esq.**
Former Attorney for Black Intervenors (*Overton v. Austin Board of Trustees)* and Former Local Counsel for NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc.

10. **Ms. Evelyn Bonavita**
Former City Council PTA President, Austin

11. **Mr. William Brandon**
Principal, Gullett Elementary School, AISD

12. **Mr. Richard Buerger**
Member, Northeast Action Committee (NEAC) and Resident of Northeast Austin and Lyndon Baines Johnson High School Community

13. **Mr. Dan Bullock**
Chairperson, Austin Adopt-A-School Program, and Member of Governor's Staff

14. **Mr. James T. Butler**
Executive Secretary, Texas State Teachers Association, Austin

15. **Mr. Melvin Chambers**
Associate Principal, Johnston High School, AISD, and Treasurer of Austin Association of Public School Administrators (AAPSA)

16. **Ms. Billie Chambers**
Former President, Austin City Council of Parents and Teachers

17. **Mr. Andrew Chin**
Senior, Austin High School, AISD and Co-Editor, Austin High School *Maroon*

18. **Mrs. Nan Clayton**
Secretary, Board of Trustees, AISD

19. **Ms. Annette Cootes**
TSTA Staff Member, and Former Executive Director of the Austin Association of Teachers, Inc.

20. **Ms. Marie Cortez**
Assistant Principal, O'Henry Junior High School, AISD

21. **Mr. Will David Davis, Esq.**
Former Member, AISD Board of Trustees

22. **Rep. Wilhelmina Delco**
State Representative, House of Representatives and Chair, Committee on Higher Education, Texas State Legislature, and Former Member, AISD Board of Trustees

23. **Mrs. Carol Deuser**
Teacher, T.A. Brown Elementary School, AISD

24. **Mr. Larry Deuser**
Former Officer, Austin Alliance for a Smooth Transition, and Former City Councilman, Austin

25. **Rev. Dr. Freddie B. Dixon**
Pastor, Wesley United Methodist Church, Austin

26. **Dr. John Ellis**
Superintendent, Austin Independent School District, Austin

27. **Mr. Robert Enos**
Principal, Crockett High School and Immediate Past President of AAPSA, AISD

28. **Ms. Charlotte Fields**
Senior, Austin High School, AISD

29. **Mr. John Fleming**
President, PTA Council of Pearce Junior High School and Past President, PTA Council of Andrews Elementary School

30. **Dr. Hobart L. Gaines**
Assistant Superintendent for School and Community Relations, AISD (Retired-1982)

31. **Mr. Gustavo (Gus) L. Garcia, CPA**
Former Member, AISD Board of Trustees

32. **Mr. Arturo Gil**
Former Member, Court Appointed Tri-ethnic Committee, Austin (1976-79)

33. **Mrs. Vera Givens**
Member, Northeastern Action Committee (NEAC) Core Group and Parent, Lyndon Baines Johnson High School Community

34. **Mr. Rolando Gonzales**
Member, Northeastern Action Committee (NEAC) Core Group, Lyndon Baines Johnson High School Community

35. **Ms. Donna Green**
Former Project Director, Austin Alliance For A Smooth Transition (1977-80)

36. **Rev. Marvin C. Griffin**
Pastor, Ebenezer Baptist Church (East Austin) and Former Member, AISD Board of Trustees

37. **Mr. Andy Guerrero**
Principal, Houston Elementary School, AISD

38. **Mrs. Bernice Hart**
Member, AISD Board of Trustees

39. **Ms. Lisa Hickey**
Senior, Johnston High School, AISD

40. **Mr. Eugenio Hinojosa**
Principal, Allison Elementary School, AISD

41. **Ms. Ida Hunt**
Principal, Blackshear Elementary School, AISD

42. **Ms. Patricia Hunt**
Concerned Parent, Northeast Austin, University Hills/Vintage Hills

43. **Mr. Joe Jerkins**
Vice President and General Manager, KVUE Television (ABC Affiliate in Austin)

44. **Mr. Roland Johnson**
Principal, Webb Elementary School, AISD

45. **Ms. De Courcey Kelly**
Former Member, AISD Board of Trustees

46. **Mr. Paul E. Knisely, Esq.**
Former Law Clerk to Federal Judge Jack Roberts, U.S. District Court, Austin

47. **Mr. Richard Kouri**
President, Austin Association of Teachers, Inc., Austin, and Teacher on full-time release from Johnston High School, AISD

48. **Mr. Charles "Chuck" Latterell**
Principal, Barton Hills Elementary School, AISD

49. **Ms. Mary Macora**
Senior, Johnston High School, AISD

50. **Mr. Hilbert Maldonado**
Past President, Northeast Action Committee (NEAC)

51. **Ms. Judy Malone**
Concerned Citizen and Friend of Hispanic Parent, Connie Colina Vargas

52. **Mr. Ray Mariotti**
Editor, *The American Statesman*, Austin

53. **Mrs. Ruth McAllister**
Assistant Superintendent, Elementary Education, AISD

54. **Ms. Bertha Means**
Instructional Coordinator, Secondary Reading, (Grades 7-12), AISD,

55. **Ms. Barbara Miller**
Former Television Talk Show Co-Host, KTBC (CBS Affiliate in Austin)

56. **Mr. John Montgomery**
Chair, Bond Committee; and Member, Executive Committee of Forming the Future

57. **Mr. Rudy Munguia**
Principal, Brooke Elementary School and Former Secretary, Austin Association of Public School Administrators (AAPSA), AISD

58. **Mr. Manuel Navarro**
Vice President, AISD Board of Trustees

59. **Ms. Donna New**
Teacher, Zavala Elementary School, AISD

60. **Rev. James Obey**
Pastor, David's Chapel Missionary Baptist Church, Austin

61. **Mr. Volma Overton**
Past President, Austin Branch NAACP (1963-83)

62. **Mr. Eric Packwood**
Student, Austin High School, AISD

63. **Mr. Bill Pardue**
Teacher, Government and American History, Johnston High School, AISD

64. **Mr. Mel Pennington**
Program Manager, KTUV, (NBC Affiliate in Austin)

65. **Mr. Al Perez**
UniServ Representative, UniServ Region 13A, Austin Association of Teachers, Inc.

66. **Monsignor Lonnie Reyes**
Chancery, Catholic Diocese of Austin

67. **Mr. Dan Robertson**
Desegregation Specialist, AISD

68. **Dr. Stephen Rodi**
President, Windsor Park Neighborhood Association, Austin

69. **Mr. Abel Ruiz**
Member, AISD Board of Trustees

70. **Mr. Wayne Ryder**
Principal, Joslin Elementary School, AISD

71. **Ms. Carole Keeton Rylander**
Member, Texas State Board of Insurance, Former Mayor, City of Austin, Former Member, AISD Board of Trustees, and Former Teacher, AISD

72. **Mr. Adan Salgado**
Principal, Johnston High School, AISD

73. **Ms. Betty Sanders**
Principal, Wooten Elementary School, AISD, and President, Austin Association of Public School Administrators (AAPSA)

74. **Mr. Luther Simond**
Principal, Ridgetop Elementary School, AISD

75. **Mr. Ed C. Small, Esq.**
President, AISD Board of Trustees

76. **Mr. Booker Snell**
Teacher, Psychology and Sociology, Austin High School, AISD

77. **Mr. Jimmy Snell**
County Commissioner, Travis County and Former Member, Austin City Council

78. **Mr. Neal Spelce**
Austin Businessman, Communications Firm

79. **Ms. Virginia L. Stewart**
Senior, Johnston High School, AISD

80. **Ms. Marie Thompson**
Teacher, Zavala Elementary School, AISD

81. **Ms. Jetta Todara**
Special Assistant to the Superintendent, AISD

82. **Mr. E. Gay Walker**
Director of Transportation, AISD

83. **Ms. Jane Wells**
Community Leader; Former Education Committee Chair, "Forming the Future"

84. **Mr. Tommy Wyatt**
Publisher, *Villager* Newspaper, Austin (Since 1973)

85. **Mr. Evan Yeakel**
Student, Austin High School, AISD

86. **Mr. William "Bill" Youngblood**
Austin Businessman and Owner, TERMINEX, Austin

Seattle February 13-15, 1984

1. **Mr. Richard "Dick" Alexander**
Former Member, Board of Directors, Seattle Public Schools, (1969-83)

2. **Ms. Barbara Arnold**
Principal, Nathan Hale High School, Seattle Public Schools

3. **Ms. Juana Augerot**
Principal, Concord Elementary School, Seattle Public Schools

4. **Ms. Roberta Barr**
Retired Principal (High School), 1981, Seattle Public Schools

5. **Mr. Robert A. Bass**
Principal, Madrona Elementary School, Seattle Public Schools

6. **Ms. Patricia Benavidez**
Former Classroom Teacher (Junior/Senior H.S.), Seattle Public Schools

7. **Dr. Willard Bill**
Supervisor, Indian Education, State Division of Public Instruction

8. **Dr. Forbes Bottomly**
Former Superintendent of Schools, 1965-73, Seattle Public Schools

9. **Dr. Frank Brouillet**
State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Washington State Division of Public Instruction

10. **Ms. Kay Bullitt**
Former First Chair, Coalition for Quality Integrated Education, Seattle

11. **Mr. Emory Bundy**
Former Director, Public Affairs, KING-TV

12. **Dr. Warren Burton**
Director, Multicultural and Equity Education, Washington State Division of Public Instruction

13. **Ms. Vivian M. Carson**
Regional Director, West Coast Region, NAACP

14. **Rev. Dr. William Cate**
President and Director, Church Council of Greater Seattle

15. **Mr. Robert L. Cathey**
Regional Curriculum Consultant, Arts and Music, Seattle Public Schools

16. **Ms. Maisy Chan**
Senior, Franklin High School, Seattle Public Schools

17. **Ms. Jonis Davis**
Former Representative and Staff Member, American Friends Service Committee, Greater Seattle

18. **Mr. Scott Davis**
Student, Cleveland High School, Seattle Public Schools

19. **Mr. Stober M. Davis, III**
Student, Ingraham High School, Seattle Public Schools

20. **Mr. Robert Dorse**
President, Citizens for Voluntary Integration Committee (CIVIC) and Resident, North Seattle

21. **Mr. Ken Dorsett**
Principal, Eckstein Intermediate School, Seattle Public Schools

22. **Dr. Richard Dyksterhuis**
Desegregation Planner, Department of Integration and Special Programs, Seattle Public Schools

23. **Mr. Oscar Easonia, Jr.**
Representative, Blacks in Government, Seattle

24. **Ms. Kathyrn Ekstrom**
Senior, Franklin High School, Seattle Public Schools

25. **Ms. Tyra Elliott**
Secretary, Board of Directors, Seattle Urban League

26. **Ms. Audrey Elmore**
Senior, Franklin High School, Seattle Public Schools

27. **Ms. Kathi Elske**
Paraprofessional Staff Member, Office Personnel Department and Member, Seattle Teachers Association (STA)

28. **Mr. Robert Flaming**
Student, Cleveland High School, Seattle Public Schools

29. **Ms. Mazzie Fleet**
Senior, Franklin High School, Seattle Public Schools

30. **Dr. Robert Gary**
Supervisor, Secondary Division, Seattle Public Schools

31. **Mr. Carver Gayton**
Manager, Educational Relations Training, Boeing Company and Former Member, Board of Directors, Seattle Public Schools (1973-75)

32. **Ms. Jennifer Gerber**
Student, Roosevelt High School, Seattle Public Schools

33. **Mr. Lawrence Gerstle**
Student, Roosevelt High School, Seattle Public Schools

34. **Ms. Shelley Grant**
Student, Roosevelt High School, Seattle Public Schools

35. **Ms. Kay Grover**
Past President, PTSA and Representative, Church Council of Greater Seattle's Task Force on Racial Justice In Education

36. **Mr. Rodney Hain**
Sophomore, Franklin High School, Seattle Public Schools

37. **Dr. Frank Hanawalt**
Former Assistant Director of Desegregation, Seattle Public Schools

38. **Mr. Steve Harriott**
Sophomore, Franklin High School, Seattle Public Schools

39. **Mr. Wesley Harris**
Assistant Executive Director, Seattle Teachers Association

40. **Ms. Hilo Hasagawa**
Librarian, Emerson Elementary School, Seattle Public Schools

41. **Mr. Robert Haynes**
Student, Cleveland High School, Seattle Public Schools

42. **Ms. Mary Henry**
Librarian, South Shore Middle School, Seattle Public Schools

43. **Ms. Amy Hevly**
Student, Roosevelt High School, Seattle Public Schools

44. **Mr. Gil Hirabayashi**
Staff Member, Community Relations Service, U.S. Department of Justice

45. **Ms. Jessica Hirschfelder**
Student, Roosevelt High School, Seattle Public Schools

46. **Ms. Suzanne Hittman**
Former Member, Board of Directors, Seattle Public Schools (1975-81)

47. **Mr. Michael Hoge, Esq.**
General Counsel, Seattle Public Schools

48. **Ms. Dorothy Hollingsworth**
Former Member, Board of Directors, Seattle Public Schools (1975-81)

49. **Mr. Bryan Johnson**
Former Radio News Director, KOMO Radio, Presently Correspondent/Analyst, KOMO Radio and TV, Austin

50. **Ms. Annie Jones**
Former President, Central Area School Council, Seattle Public Schools

51. **Ms. Bettie Sing Luke Kan**
Community Activist and Member, Asian and Chinese Community Educational Task Force

52. **Ms. Sara Kaplan**
Speech and Debate Coach, Franklin High School, Seattle Public Schools

53. **Mr. Don Kazama**
Former Vice Chairman of Seattle Human Rights Commission

54. **Ms. Kathy Keeney**
Senior, Ingraham High School, Seattle Public Schools

55. **Ms. Vicki King**
Parent of Elementary Student

56. **Mr. Don Kinsley**
Principal, Mercer Intermediate School, Seattle Public Schools

57. **Ms. Amy Kirkman**
Senior, Ingraham High School, Seattle Public Schools

58. **Mr. Art Kono**
Former Member, Desegregation Planning Team, Seattle Public Schools

59. **Ms. Doris Kyle**
Student, Nathan Hale High School, Seattle Public Schools

60. **Mr. James Kyle**
Student, Roosevelt High School, Seattle Public Schools

61. **Mr. Dan Levant**
Former First Chair, Districtwide Advisory Committee (DWAC), Seattle Public Schools

62. **Mr. Reese Lindquist**
President, Washington Education Association

63. **Mr. Thomas Lord**
Principal, Meany Intermediate School, Seattle Public Schools

64. **Mr. Marc Masnik**
Student, Roosevelt High School, Seattle Public Schools

65. **Mr. Meredith Mathews**
Representative, Central Area Civil Rights Committee, Seattle

66. **Mr. James McAuliffe**
Principal, Laurelhurst Elementary School, Seattle Public Schools

67. **Mr. Jim McConnell**
Principal, Franklin High School, Seattle Public Schools

68. **Ms. Louise McKinney**
Principal, Sacajawea Elementary School, Seattle Public Schools

69. **Rev. Dr. Samuel B. McKinney**
Pastor, Mt. Zion Baptist Church and Former Member, Board of Directors, Seattle Public Schools

70. **Mr. Ammon McWashington**
Principal, Garfield High School, Seattle Public Schools

71. **Ms. Patricia (Poc) Megna**
Desegregation Analyst/Planner, Seattle Public Schools

72. **Ms. Lisa Michaels**
Junior, Roosevelt High School, Seattle Public Schools

73. **Dr. David L. Moberly**
Former Superintendent, 1976-81, Seattle Public Schools

74. **Mr. John Moffitt**
Principal, Kimball Elementary School, Seattle Public Schools

75. **Mr. Mako Nakagawa**
Member, Washington Asian Pacific Association (WAPA) and Immediate Past President, Japanese American Student League; Principal, Cooper Elementary School, Seattle Public Schools

76. **Mr. Robert L. Nelson**
Superintendent, Seattle Public Schools
(As of February 1, 1984)

77. **Mr. Pete Neuschwander**
President, Seattle Teachers Association

78. **Mr. Frederick L. Noland, Esq.**
General Counsel, Seattle Branch ACLU

79. **Ms. Teresa Oh**
Former Chair, Filipino Educational Task Force and Member, Washington State Advisory Council

80. **Ms. Arlene Oki**
Representative, Japanese Americans Citizens League (JACL) and Former First Vice Chair, Districtwide Advisory Committee (DWAC), Seattle Public Schools

81. **Mr. Tony Orange**
Executive Director, Coalition of Quality Education; Past President, Central Area School Council; Staff Member, Integration and Special Programs Department, Seattle Public Schools

82. **Ms. Barbara Perry**
Primary Teacher, Seattle Public Schools

83. **Ms. Dee Pinkerton**
Student, Roosevelt High School, Seattle Public Schools

84. **Mr. Lawrence Ransom**
Chair, Desegregation Advisory Committee (DRAC) and Chair, Greater Seattle Chamber of Commerce

85. **Dr. Harold Reasby**
Superintendent of Schools, Edmonds School District

86. **Ms. Joan Roberson**
Principal, Roosevelt High School, Seattle Public Schools

87. **Mayor Charles Royer**
Mayor, City of Seattle

88. **Ms. Randi Ryan**
Member, Board of Directors, Seattle Public Schools

89. **Ms. Becky Sasaki**
Senior, Ingraham High School,
Seattle Public Schools

90. **Ms. Lora Schuldt**
Junior, Roosevelt High School,
Seattle Public Schools

91. **Ms. Ann Siqueland**
Member, Desegregation Revision Advisory
Committee and Author, *Without a Court Order*

92. **Ms. Judi Smith**
Student, Ingraham High School,
Seattle Public Schools

93. **Ms. Lacy Steele**
President, Seattle Branch of NAACP

94. **Mr. Robert Stevens**
Student, Cleveland High School,
Seattle Public Schools

95. **Mr. Philip Swain**
Member, Washington State Board of Education

96. **Mr. Andres Tangalin**
Principal, Marshall Alternative School,
Seattle Public Schools

97. **Mr. Jun Tay**
Student, Cleveland High School,
Seattle Public Schools

98. **Ms. Margie Taylor**
Sophomore, Roosevelt High School,
Seattle Public Schools

99. **Mr. Andre Tiffany**
Junior, Rainier High School, Seattle Public Schools

100. **Dr. J. Loren Troxel**
Former Superintendent of Schools
Seattle Public Schools

101. **Mr. T.J. Vassar**
Vice President, Board of Directors,
Seattle Public Schools

102. **Ms. Stephanie Washington**
Student, Cleveland High School,
Seattle Public Schools

103. **Ms. Janie White**
Student, Cleveland High School,
Seattle Public Schools

104. **Mr. R.W. Wilkinson**
Former Deputy Mayor City of Seattle

105. **Dr. Collin Williams**
Director of Integration and Special Programs,
Seattle Public Schools

106. **Dr. Robert L. Williams**
Former Assistant Director of Desegregation,
Seattle Public Schools

107. **Mr. Victor Wood**
Student, Franklin High School,
Seattle Public Schools

108. **Ms. Kathy Woodward**
Student, Ingraham High School,
Seattle Public Schools

109. **Ms. Verleeta Wooten**
Student, Ingraham High School,
Seattle Public Schools

APPENDIX II

Thoughts on School Desegregation

Presented to The National Education Association Inquiry Panel by John Ellis, Superintendent of Schools, Austin, Texas, January 11, 1984

School Desegregation

School desegregation in America presents a confused picture. There are examples of solid leadership, outstanding communication and genuine success. Conversely, there are examples of conflict, white flight and apparent failure. Austin generally can be said to be one of the outstanding examples of success, however, even in Austin, there are concerns and remaining problems. It is easy to exploit the mixed findings to justify various conclusions, consequently any discussion of desegregation ought to be tempered by the realization that the topic is complex and no consensus on next steps seems to exist.

While acknowledging the complexities, I conclude that our current efforts to promote school desegregation on a city by city basis, largely through the courts, are too fragmented to be productive. Renewed emphasis on desegregation and new strategies will be required. In assessing what should be the national policy for the next 5-10 years the following factors need to be seriously addressed for they are central to developing a program that will gain the acceptance of the American people.

1. LACK OF NATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Little visible national leadership has been given to desegregation. Politicians in general sense that desegregation, at least as expressed in the term 'busing", is an issue that is best avoided and, if necessary opposed. We are not communicating the message that desegregating our society is a moral imperative that deserves sacrifice. The issue has been largely left to a few civil rights activists and to the courts.

2. RACISM

It is an unfortunate condition, but many whites, blacks, and browns still harbor deeply rooted hostile attitudes toward one another. This fundamental problem has a multiplier effect on the negative attitudes people have towards the inconveniences of desegregation. We can't wait to desegregate until racism is ended, but if we hope

to conquer the evil effects of segregation and discrimination, the issue of racism needs attention.

3. UNCLEAR BENEFITS

The benefits of desegregation are not immediately obvious. Preparation for life in an integrated world, or the richness that comes from sharing with diverse cultures, are benefits that seem esoteric or undesirable to many people particularly if they will be inconvenienced to obtain these benefits. The research on the educational results of desegregation is mixed. It is reasonable to conclude that where desegregation is carried out in a conscientious, sensitive manner the educational results are satisfactory. Children aren't hurt by it and some are helped. But you can't point with any assurance to major education gains for any group solely because of desegregation.

4. GOVERNMENT INTERFERENCE WITH A FUNDAMENTAL CHOICE IN LIFE STYLE

The purchase of a home is the largest expenditure most families ever make. Some families make huge sacrifices to purchase a home in a "good" neighborhood with "good" schools. Sometimes such efforts are racially motivated, but more often the desire stems from the drive to better oneself and give one's children greater opportunities. When the government interferes with the parents' choice by "busing" children to schools out of the neighborhood, deep emotions are triggered. While there is some truth to the saying of black civil rights leaders: "It ain't the bus, it's us"; the problem is oversimplified if it is perceived solely as resistance to mixing with other races.

5. INCONVENIENCE

Americans are practical, pragamatic people. It doesn't make sense to go farther to school than is necessary or to increase travel time, gasoline costs, communication problems, etc., for anything that is not highly desirable. For many people desegregation is not a goal that merits sacrifice.

6. LACK OF FAIRNESS

Americans are essentially fair minded. We generally respond positively if challenged to do something significant if it seems basically fair. Ensuring that minorities have equal opportunity can strike a positive note, but when suburbs, private schools and other areas are exempt from participating, it flies in the face of what many people consider to be a fair or consistent policy.

7. ESCAPE HATCHES

Convenient suburbs, and private schools are tempting alternatives for people who wish to escape desegregation. In many urban areas, the suburbs appear to offer superior living conditions and superior schools. The movement to the suburbs has occurred without respect to desegregation, but there are some, perhaps many, people who go to the suburbs with "escape" from desegregation as a primary motive.

8. WHITE MAJORITY SYNDROME

It is generally a new experience for whites to be in the minority in the U.S. Many will go to great lengths to avoid a situation that assigns their children to a minority dominated school. While there are no clear standards, I have observed that when the minority population reaches 50 to 60 percent, desegregation becomes difficult because of white flight. At minority levels beyond 60 percent a serious question must be raised about how mandatory transfers of whites can be effective so they will remain in the new environments.

Many more factors could be cited, but I have selected those that in my personal experience have persisted over a long period of time and reflect the beliefs and attitudes of a large section of the population that will ultimately determine whether any policy will be effective.

Proposals for Action

Listed below are brief summaries of key activities that speak to some of the difficulties previously cited. They should form a central core of the efforts we make to further desegregation in the next decade.

FOCUS ON STATEWIDE OR REGIONAL EFFORTS

States need to be more energetic in promoting desegregation. School districts are essentially creatures of the States, hence statewide remedies are more apt to minimize the escape hatches of the suburbs as well as provide fiscal resources for success. Importantly, there are only 50 states while there are 16,000 school districts, hence it makes sense to take an approach that is both more efficient and puts states in a responsible role they ought to perform.

DEVELOP FINANCIAL INCENTIVES

Americans like to win. Many desegregation programs are based on school districts which lose a court case and are forced to desegregate with too few resources to be successful. The psychology needs to be reversed so that desegregating is a winning strategy where financial rewards are received and better education is evident. Here are some examples of financial incentives:

1. Loan subsidies for people who purchase homes in certain neighborhoods to improve integration should be provided. Loans should be awarded to anglos and minorities depending upon which would contribute to the integration of the area. The integration of housing has to be one of the key strategies of the future rather than relying solely on the schools.

2. Incentive grants should be provided for schools with certain numbers of minorities so that special programs and support services can exist and lower pupil teacher ratios can be maintained in integrated schools than those in the all-white or predominately-white schools. In short, make the integrated schools superior with greater resources.

3. Long-term grants for five or ten years should be available to school districts that are engaged in desegregation. It is important to

have continuity and institutionalize some of the improvements rather than the one year, "now you have it, now you don't" grants of the past.

EMPHASIZE QUALITY EDUCATION

The first question parents ask about a desegregated school is "Will my child be safe?" Then then they ask "Will my child learn?" Desegregated schools have to be made top quality in every respect. Too frequently they become mired in the safety question or fail to reach the point of undeniable educational quality. Desegregated schools have to become synonymous with quality. Until they do, middle class flight of black, browns, and whites will paralyze efforts to improve quality.

DEEMPHASIZE MANDATORY REASSIGNMENTS

A key stumbling block to many people is "forced" reassignment to a different building because of race. The finely tuned racial balance court orders designed to eliminate "root and branch" the dual school systems were necessary and have served a useful purpose. We now live in a different era where some breakthroughs in housing, jobs, and role models exist. Perhaps we can now rely less on mandatory transfers to achieve precisely defined racial levels and more on incentives in both schooling and housing.

INITIATE COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENTS

Schools are the products of private housing patterns, highway systems, zoning laws, water distribution systems, public housing projects, etc., over which they frequently have little control. Efforts need to be made to bring together all the pieces to assess how we can promote a desegregated or integrated society and not focus solely on public schools as if they were independent, self-determining institutions.

ENCOURAGE FLEXIBILITY

We need to be much more flexible in experimenting with magnet schools, new curricula, school-work assignments, community involvement, business adopt-a-school programs, city-suburb exchanges, etc. The racial mix can happen if we have the right mix of incentives and flexibility.

DEVELOP NEW GENERATION OF DESEGREGATION PLANNERS

The current crop of desegregation planners tend to be expert in the mechanical process of pairing, clustering, and otherwise racially balancing school districts while giving some attention to human relations and communications. In the early years of desegregation, the distrust of school boards and superintendents was high and planners developed programs in the face of overwhelming odds. The distrust still lingers and a proprietary interest seems to exist in defining desegregation in the old terms. We need to stimulate new ideas, and we need to encourage a whole new generation of desegregation experts who can assess the current conditions, redefine desegregation and develop appropriate strategies to achieve success.

APPROPRIATE SUFFICIENT MONEY

One can only speculate what the nation would be like today if the federal government had set a high priority on school desegregation. What if a $3 billion program had been funded annually rather than the $300 million funded during the peak years of ESAA, 1978 and 1979? I believe that a major opportunity was lost. Interdistrict transfers, magnet school programs, and incentive grants could have altered the educational landscape if sufficient federal dollars had been added to the actions of the federal courts. The Emergency School Aid Act of 1972 stands as a program with noble intentions that contributed substantially to individual school districts but it was, in effect, terminated when it became part of the block grant program monies in 1982. There are many federal programs that are desirable; however, a program to promote desegregation is one of the few that can be termed critical. We ought to put our money on the key priorities that determine whether we will continue to exist as a free nation where citizens can realize their full constitutional rights.

PROVIDE LEADERSHIP

While mentioned last, it should be first for it is doubtful that much will occur without leadership. The 30th anniversary of *Brown* should be a national celebration of past accomplishments and a challenge to remove the remaining obstacles. Unfortunately, there is little enthusiam to give major visibility to a battle scarred ideal like desegregation. It is politically risky and no consensus on next steps seems to exist. The desegregation process may well wither on the vine unless some new directions can be mounted that will generate more widespread enthusiasm and support from the people. That is unlikely to happen until we break out of the pattern of school district by school district prosecution through the courts, on a racial balance basis, with too few resources to do the job well, while suburbs and states stay largely on the sidelines. Clearly, leadership that challenges the nation to respond affirmatively is a critical ingredient that is long overdue.